

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 66-VOL. III, NO. 14.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

The STANDARD has been removed from 104 Dr. Walker's address all communications to 127 North 16th St.

CONTENTS

Awakening Thought.
Single Tax Men in Council.
The Lehigh Region.
A Clergyman's Letter.
London Society.
Pen, Pate and Sclerom.
Queries and Answers.
A Glimpse of Temis Methods.
Events in England and Australia.
Protection by Blizard.
From Indianapolis.
Society Notes.
General Bryce's Call.
The Language of the World.
A Machine That Will Earn a Salary.
Alien Landlords.
All Along the Line.
The Western War.
Getting into Society.
Straws Which Show the Wind.
Herve Niel.
Farmer Jones and the Tariff.
Our Indians.
A Glimpse of Terrace.
Duty on Coffee.
Ode to a Pig.
Mary and Dick.
Publisher's Notes.
Life on Thirty Salaries a Week.
Personal.

AWAKENING THOUGHT.

The Mills tariff bill was reported to the house on Monday substantially as it has been printed. The main changes are a somewhat higher duty on the lower grades of refined sugar, to please the Louisiana sugar planters, and a somewhat lower duty on the winter grades, to meet the objection that the reduction in the duty might inure to the advantage of the sugar trust, and the striking out of the provision doing away with the drawback on the exportation of refined sugar, presumably to compensate the trust. However, there is no reason to blame the committee for these comparatively small concessions to the "infant industries," who have so long had their own way that they have come to believe they have a vested right to plunder their fellow citizens and strangle the industry of a great nation. In the excellent report which accompanies the bill, and in which the absurdities and inequities of the present tariff duties that the committee propose to abolish or modify are well set forth, it is explained that the bill is not such as the committee would have wished to make it, but all they thought it at present wise to propose. And although it does not "say free trade once" the report bristles with good free trade arguments.

We real free traders, whose aim is the abolition of the last shred of a duty, have, indeed, good reason to be satisfied with the work of the committee and with the efficient support the administration has evidently given it. As an entering wedge—for this is all it is—the Mills bill is good enough, and seems well constructed for the purpose of concentrating strength and minimizing resistance. For the present time and situation it is probably better than a more radical bill would be. It will not pass into law, and it may not even pass the house without weakening amendments, but it scares and rouses the protectionists almost as much as a bill abolishing the tariff would. And what is the great thing, it will bring on the tariff fight, and make a clear issue between the parties.

The republican report is a howl of thoroughly alarmed protectionism. It denounces the action of the majority in refusing to hear endless pleas from tariff beneficiaries to retain the taxes on the people, by which they alone profit, and repeats in many variations the old story that tariff reductions will ruin American industry and pauperize the American laborer. The debate on the bill begins on the 17th.

The press in all parts of the country is teeming with evidences that the tariff question has taken such a hold on the popular mind that nothing can now prevent it from becoming the issue before the people in the coming presidential election. On the one side, what began as timid advocacy of tariff reform is amounting into denunciations of protection and something like demands for free trade. And on the other hand protectionists, already thoroughly alarmed, are manifesting the greatest activity and putting forth claims that of themselves will compel men to examine the protective principle who never really thought of it before.

It makes no difference what sort of a tariff bill gets through congress, or whether any bill is passed or not. It makes little difference what the party platforms may be. The question before the American people in the campaign that will begin in June will be no matter of "tariff tinkering," but the question between the theory of protection and the theory of free trade. Already a popular discussion of the tariff question is going on such as has never gone on in this generation. Day by day and week by week, ever since President Cleveland's message brought the tariff question into practical politics, this discussion has become wider and hotter. So must it continue to grow. It will receive a fresh impetus with the opening in congress on the 17th of the discussion of the Mills bill, and a still stronger impetus with the meeting of the democratic convention in the early days of June, at which it is now certain nothing but his death can prevent the nomination of Mr. Cleveland. The re-

publican convention will then follow, and with it a national campaign will begin which for vigor and intensity is likely to equal anything in our national history. It will be, indeed, a fight of giants. On the one side, the democratic party under a leadership which promises to rid it of the timidity that has so long hampered it, and in possession of the national administration. And on the other side the republican party, reinforced secretly, if not openly, by the Randalls and the Danas, and backed by the money and influence of the trusts and combinations that find their profit in protection.

In such a campaign as this, any attempt to run a third candidate on a single tax platform would not only be idle but harmful. The chimerical scheme of running a presidential candidate on a platform that will ignore the tariff question, which underlies the call for a convention at Cincinnati in May, is about as hopeful as would have been the attempt on the 12th of March to get up a picnic procession through the streets of New York that should ignore the blizzard. Before November comes the discussion will rage so furiously that every voter in the country will have some sort of opinion and some sort of a preference on the tariff question. Men will be irresistibly driven to take sides.

The idea that some of our friends still entertain, that a third party candidate should be run on a single tax platform, which should proclaim for absolute free trade is equally chimerical. The votes that such a movement could retain would be so many votes withdrawn from the free trade side in the practical struggle against protection. And it is not in human nature that men who even now feel strongly upon the tariff question should, when the discussion reaches the boiling point, be willing to cast their votes for a free trade candidate for whom there is no hope, at the risk of seeing rampant protectionism emerge triumphant from the bitter contest that is going on.

Thus, no independent candidate could bring out anything like the real single tax strength; and if a move to put one in the field, no matter on what platform, was generally concurred in by the active friends of the movement, it could serve no purpose but to create in the public mind an idea of the weakness of the movement that would lessen its influence and retard its growth, and make it far harder to rally our friends for direct action on state lines when the national campaign should be over.

But so far from all this being a matter of regret, it is a matter for the heartiest congratulation. The bitter contest between the two great parties that is now impending will do more for our cause than we could by any possibility do for it by direct action as a third party.

Our great aim has been to get the labor question into practical politics. It was for this that the conference of labor organizations nominated me for mayor of New York, and for this that I accepted the nomination. It was for this that the united labor party was organized, and for this that we made the campaign last year. And it was in the hope of doing something to this end that we looked forward to entering the national campaign this year.

Our dream of doing this is ended. But why? Because the labor question is already in practical politics. Because it is already clear that it is on the labor question that the two great parties are this year to fight one of the bitterest political battles that ever took place in the United States. One has but to notice the discussion that is already going on to see how true this is. Everywhere—in congress, in the press, in the magazines, in the talk of man with man—discussion of the effect of this or that particular change in the tariff is being merged and lost in the discussion of the principle of protection. And it is on its effect on the wages and conditions of labor that this is turning. This, it is evident, will be the vital point around which the controversy will rage.

Could we possibly ask anything better? Could there be anything more conducive to the spreading of that light that we are trying to spread; to the dispelling of that ignorance which is the great obstacle our movement encounters? The general discussion of whether the tariff does or does not raise and maintain wages, whether protection is or is not the only thing that can keep laborers above the line of pauperism, must inevitably compel the discussion of what it really is that makes wages high or low—of what is the real cause that turns into paupers men who are ready to work.

There are some of our friends, like Mr. Pentecost, thorough free traders that he is, who are disgusted with the old parties and their possible candidates that they declare they will not vote for neither even if they write their own ballots. This is April, and the political thermometer will rise steadily and rapidly from now on to November. If they are of the same mind then as now, they will find in Thomas Jefferson and George Washington perfectly unexceptionable names to write on their ballots. In the meantime, vote as they may, let them take part in the discussion. It is the discussion rather than the vote that is the important thing.

In striking and instructive contrast with

Cardinal Manning's "Pleading for the Worthless," printed in THE STANDARD of last week, is Vicar General Preston's "Socialism and the Catholic Church" in the current number of the Forum. Through the one breathes that spirit of broad and deep humanity which attracts, ardent and loving souls to the Catholic church; through the other that spirit, dear to those who profit by injustice, that makes so many deeply religious natures hate it. Cardinal Manning pleads for those who are crushed, body and soul, under the pressure of an unjust social system; Vicar General Preston pleads for the system that crushes them. The one is the foremost of English speaking Catholics—a "prince of the church," standing on the very highest round of ecclesiastical distinction that any man, not born an Italian, can in our times hope to reach; the other is a mere "monsignor," the vicar general, or first assistant of an archbishop. Yet, unfortunately, it is the vicar general, not the cardinal, who in this represents the general spirit of the hierarchy—the general spirit, not merely of the Catholic hierarchy, but of the clergy of all the Christian churches. For no matter how much the various sects into which Christianity has been split may differ as to things of no moment, or what fierce strife they may wage as to vestments, or rituals, or dogmas, the influence of the greater part of the clergy of all creeds is to-day—as, with a few noble exceptions, it has been since Constantine married Roman imperialism with the religion of the Carpenter's Son—exerted on the side of oppression and against the oppressed.

The title of Monsignor Preston's article is a misnomer. He discusses the relations of the Catholic church, not to what is generally understood by socialism, but to the doctrines with which my name has been associated. These doctrines, in his title and throughout his article, he endeavors to confound with socialism in its commonly understood sense, although he must know, if only by the attitude of the socialists themselves, that they are in vital points diametrically opposed to socialism.

Says Monsignor Preston:

Communism and socialism, in the general acceptance of these terms, are related to each other, and differ only in degree, while they are one in principle. Socialism denies the right of private ownership in capital or in land, or in both. Communism denies every kind of ownership, and asserts the individual equality of all men as to all things. The socialism which has been advanced in this country of late, as a panacea for human ills, denies that there is, or can be, any private property in land. We quote the exact words of Mr. Henry George: "We must make land common property." "If private property in land is just, then the remedy I propose is a false one; if, on the contrary, private property in land is unjust, then is the remedy the true one."

This is the statement of the doctrine that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable that Monsignor Preston chooses for his attack. Of it he says: (1) "It is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations and would destroy the present order of society;" and (2) "It is contrary to the law of God and the teaching of the Catholic church."

As to the first contentions of Monsignor Preston I am quite willing to admit them. The great reform I contend for is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations, if by their constitutions is meant existing laws and prevailing customs. But, as has been decided by the supreme court of the United States and by the supreme court of the state of New York, it is not, as Monsignor Preston says it is, inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and with the Constitution of the state of New York. It is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations only as a little while ago the denial of the right of property in human flesh and blood was contrary to the constitutions of all civilized nations—only as a little while ago the denial of the right of the state to establish a religion and to hang or burn all who did not conform to it, was contrary to the constitutions of all civilized nations. And it would destroy the present order of society, in the sense of destroying that order which everywhere makes the laboring class the poor class and gives command of the products of labor to those who scorn labor—the order brings deepening want with increasing wealth; that builds brothel and almshouse and penitentiary while it erects the church—sets class against class and nation against nation; that makes our Christianity a mockery; and that with every advance of civilization is intensifying forces that must disintegrate and destroy. In this sense I plead guilty to the charge of desiring to overthrow the constitution of every civilized state and to destroy the present order of society. But it might be worth Monsignor Preston's while to observe that this is precisely what the early Christians wanted to do.

Whether "this kind of socialism," as Monsignor Preston persists in calling it, which holds that every child of God is equally entitled to the use of natural opportunities, is contrary to the law of God, is an all important question; but whether it is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic

church or not is a matter of comparatively little importance. For if a thing be contrary to the law of God, then it must be evil, whether the Catholic church teaches against it or not. But if it be in accordance with the law of God, then if the Catholic church teaches against it, so much the worse for the Catholic church.

Monsignor Preston gives the first place in his argument to the assertion that the Catholic church has condemned the doctrine that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable. In support of this he can point to no decision of ecumenical council, to no declaration of pope speaking ex-cathedra on matters of faith and doctrine and to the universal church. He can only cite vague condemnations of communism and socialism, of attacks upon the "just rights of property," and of the "confiscation of church goods and estates;" the fact that the church holds land herself, and the letter of condonation from the present pope to Archbishop Corrigan, in which, lamenting the "rebellion" of Dr. McGlynn, the pontiff commands the action of the archbishop "in bringing before his supreme tribunal the false doctrines concerning the right of property disseminated among the people in newspapers and public assemblies." That the "Sacred congregation of the index" have not yet condemned my books (a matter for which he rightly intimates I care nothing, but which, by the by, M. de Laveleye of Belgium in an article in the same number of the Forum attributes to the interposition of Cardinal Gibbons), Monsignor Preston virtually says is because they have been too busy to attend to such a small matter, and continues: "When the sacred congregation sees fit in its wisdom to consider the works of Henry George, there can be no doubt that it will condemn his political economy, which is nothing but a new edition of socialism."

These are the grounds with which Archbishop Corrigan's vicar general, with the air of a whole ecumenical council, or a pope addressing the universal church ex-cathedra, declares that no Catholic can believe that men have natural and equal rights to land. If Catholics are willing to accept such authority, there is no reason why non-Catholics should make any objection. But, to say nothing of Cardinal Manning and Bishop Nulty, Catholics may cite against Monsignor Preston's dictum the equally respectable theological authority of the "Nun of Kenmore," who in her recently published "Anti-Poverty and Progress," a work in which she pulverizes my theories with arguments akin to Congressman Bryce's call, expressly declares that "the church has not yet spoken on this subject; hence Catholics are free to discuss it on its merits."

"When doctors disagree," etc.

The important question—the question that to men who believe, as I do, that there is a God and that this universe is His creation—is this: Is the doctrine that all men are equally entitled to the use of land, or—to put it in reverse form, that private property in land is unjust—contrary to the law of God? As to this, as distinguished from the question whether it is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic church, Monsignor Preston seems only able to find one peg on which to hang his assertion that it is. "We need only quote," he says, "the commandments of God: 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his house, nor his field, nor anything that is his.'"

Considering that one of the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic church is that it is the letter of the word that killeth, but the spirit that maketh to live; considering that the doctrine of the literal inspiration of the Hebrew scriptures has already almost ceased to be believed in by intelligent Christians and Jews, and is rapidly disappearing; and considering that the divine sanction of slavery and of polygamy might be far more clearly proved in the same way, this is a pretty small peg to hang such a sweeping assertion upon. But even the applicability of this deuteronomical version of the tenth commandment depends upon a false assumption which Monsignor Preston makes throughout his article—that is, that I call landlords thieves and robbers, and that no individual or corporation could for one moment justly hold any property in land, if my theory were true.

Monsignor Preston will look in vain through all that I have written to find one single sentence which will sustain this assumption. I have never called individual landlords thieves; I have never asserted that under the laws as they are no one could justly hold land; I have never called upon land holders to give up their land, or upon other individuals to take their land from them. There is a difference, which I have always recognized, between an individual wrong and a social wrong. Where slavery exists, the slave holder may justly hold his slave as against any other than the slave himself. And when property in land exists by virtue of municipal law, the legal land holder may justly hold his land as against any other individual. In a community where that species of property is recognized there can be no strain upon the conscience of the individual land owner in holding land as against other individuals, even though he may see clearly the injustice of that institution. Nor would anything be gained for society at large if he

were to give up his possessions. I have always declared the wrong involved in private property in land to be a social wrong, and the robbery which it entailed to be a robbery for which not the land owners alone, but the whole community, are responsible—those who submit to the robbery, or at least such of them as have any share of political power, as much as those who profit by it.

It would be but a threshing of straw to go over again as against Monsignor Preston the arguments that prove that the attaching to land of that absolute right of property which justly attaches to the things produced by labor is contrary to the law of God. This is not only proved deductively from principles which the human mind recognizes as self-evident truths, but inductively from the fact that private property in land always has led to gross injustice in the distribution of wealth, and that it stands in the way, not merely of material progress, but of physical health and mental and moral development. That in the matter and extension of this rolling sphere, on which countless generations have preceded him and countless generations will follow him, and of which he is but in his turn the tenant for a few years, no man can justly claim the same absolute right of dominion and disposition that he can justly claim in the things which his labor separates from it and adapts for a time to his use, is in itself so perfectly clear to the unprejudiced mind that it has to be stated to be recognized. So true is this that no one ever endeavors to really defend private property in land. When this is nominally attempted, what is really defended is private property in things produced by labor, and to make this seem to the unthinking like a defense of private property in land an effort is always made to confuse these two essentially distinct and even contradictory things.

In precisely this way Monsignor Preston endeavors to confuse the essential distinctions between the things made by God and the things made by man. But there is one thing in which he is decidedly original. Endeavoring to destroy the significance of the fact that land increases in value by the growth of the community and without effort on the part of the owner, he says:

To say that there is in any kind of property an unearned increment is not only to state what is false, but to deny the right of property altogether. The owner has the full title to all the legitimate increase of his property or he does not; if he does not, he belongs justly to the owner. If there were no increase in values there would be no inducement to hold property of any kind.

Let Monsignor Preston put this to a practical test. Let him go to Tiffany's and say: "This watch or these diamonds are not increasing in value, therefore there can be no inducement for you to hold them," and see what they would say. Or let him consider his own undisputed property. His hat, his coat, his boots, are certainly not increasing in value. Are they any the less his property, or has he no inducement to hold them?

Yet it is only by such arguments as these that any pretense can be made of justifying private property in land. Monsignor Preston makes quite as good an argument for private property in land as does Archbishop Corrigan, or Professor Sumner, or the duke of Argyll, or anyone else who has attempted it.

Such "sound without sense" would signify nothing if it were not that it indicates the position of a powerful body of men in control of a vast and influential organization. As a matter of fact, the Catholic church has not as a church condemned the self-evident truth that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable, and does not dare to. When the victory of right against wrong, of truth against error has been won, then churchmen will be ready enough to turn around and declare that the church did it. But in the mean time, with a few individual exceptions, the influence of its hierarchy—of what Dr. McGlynn so aptly calls the "machine"—is exerted to confuse the truth and to make the superstitious cower before the wrong. And this is true not merely of the Catholic church, but of all other churches. "The clergy might be usefully employed to assert the rights of mankind," wrote Gibbon, "but so closely connected are the throne and the altar that the banner of the church has seldom been seen on the side of the people." Every great social reform may find in individual priests or preachers heroic advocates, but so long as the masses are poor and the few are rich; so long as the hell of poverty yawns under every man who falls from his place; so long as those who profit by social injustice have in their gift what is necessary to support churches, every phase of the great struggle for human rights must in its first stages at least make its way against the great body of those who have been nominally consecrated to preach the gospel of human rights and human liberty. It was by no accident that the doctors of the Jewish law brought Pilate to crucify Him who came to fulfill the law.

Yet it is the good that is in a thing, and not the evil, that gives it life. It is the

spirit that breathes through Cardinal Manning's plea, and not the spirit of Monsignor Preston's, that in spite of the manner in which her influence has been used to shelter wrong makes the church still loved and influential. A type of the men and women whose good work and sweet lives have illustrated the essential beauty of Christianity, even amid its shortcomings, died in this city last week. The immense building which towers up on the corner of Lafayette place and Fourth street is one of the tangible evidences that remain of the energy, industry and organizing ability of a man who, had he devoted himself to money getting and been fairly favored by circumstances, might have left a fortune like that of Stewart. Father Drumgoole was the son of poor parents who came to New York from Ireland when he was a child. His ambition, as he grew, was to become a priest; and it proved indeed a true vocation. By hard work and close saving he managed to enter a theological college when he became a man, but obliged to leave in order to support his widowed mother, it was not until he was past forty that he was able to enter the priesthood. Then he set about establishing a home for destitute and friendless boys, named after St. Vincent de Paul. Seeing that the usual means of collection would be inadequate for what he proposed, he established a little periodical called the *Homeless Child* at a subscription of twenty-five cents a year, giving to each subscriber, by way of premium, an interest in so many masses. So successful was he that in this way he obtained means to care for some 19,000 children in all; to erect the great ten-story building on Lafayette place at a cost of nearly \$300,000, and to spend over \$400,000 besides in establishing a branch on Staten Island. When he died there were 1,400 boys in his homes.

The work this forceful man did, in spite of such difficulties, is work of the kind that gives the church strength, and its hierarchy influence even when they use it for evil. But it is not the highest work. It is good to shelter homeless children; but it is better to destroy the wrong that crowds the streets of our great cities with homeless children. It is good to relieve poverty; but it is better to end the injustice that makes poverty. It is good to enjoin men to be true and honest and loving, but it is better to remove conditions that tempt, nay that often force them to lie and steal and trample on each other.

And the truth that is spreading and that cannot be stopped or stayed in this poverty and want, and their concomitants of vice and ignorance, strife and greed, are not the results of the laws of God but of the fact that in our most important institutions, we have ignored the laws of God, and have allowed a few to take as their own that abundant provision that nature has made for all. As this truth grows and spreads, more and more of the earnest souls, like Father Drumgoole, who are moved to exertion by the sight of human waste and suffering, will entwine it with their religion and spring forward to do their part in the good work of applying to human laws God's law of justice, and bringing about on earth that kingdom of right doing of which early Christianity dreamed. Thus will the redemption of the church come.

HENRY GEORGE.

More About Senator Edmunds and the Coffee Tax.

WASHINGTON, April 2.—In the last STANDARD a correspondent refers to the fact that Senator Edmunds, in *Harper's Magazine* for February, asserted that when the duties were removed from tea and coffee the consumers received no benefits; and he inquires whether this statement is true. THE STANDARD very properly showed that even if it were true the inference which protectionists seek to draw therefrom would not follow. It may be of some interest, however, to learn what is the fact. The Brooklyn *Eagle* states, and gives the figures to prove it, that when the duty was removed from tea "the price fell off to the full extent not only of the duty, but of the profit that the dealer had been making on the duty." As for coffee, the Philadelphia *Record* says: "Senator Edmunds tripped himself up by neglecting to state that when the American tariff duty was repealed, a Brazilian export duty was imposed." Even if Senator Edmunds's statement were true, it would simply prove that after the removal of the duty the importers—or somebody—made more than a fair and equitable profit by the full amount of the duty, and that therefore competition is not, as teachers of the current political economy persist in reiterating, certain to reduce prices to the lowest point compatible with commercial prosperity.

J. L. MCCREERY.

Forgiving Them That Trespass Against Him.

The Emperor Frederick has been graciously pleased, in commemoration of his accession to the throne, to issue a decree of amnesty, pardoning certain classes of criminals. The offenses to which it applies are, insulting the sovereign; crimes and misdemeanors in the exercise of civil rights; insulting or resisting officers of the law; disturbing the public order; press offenses; infractions of the law of public meeting, etc.

William T. Crossdale.

William T. Crossdale of THE STANDARD underwent an operation for hernia on Friday, March 23. He had been a sufferer from the disease for many years, and took this step after consultation with several eminent surgeons. The operation was performed by Professor Phelps, and was entirely successful. Mr. Crossdale is now rapidly convalescing, though it will be still some weeks before he can leave his bed.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Foreign Exchange.

CINCINNATI.—(1) How is the exchange of commodities effected between one country and another?

(2) When the balance of trade is in favor of a country, and a large amount of gold is sent there in consequence, what is done with it?

(3) Shall you publish the "Queries and Answers" in book form? I think they will make a valuable addition to the land and labor library.

H. W. WALCATE.

(4) For example, omitting middle men for simplicity:

Jones, an American exporter, ships cotton to Smith, an English manufacturer of cotton goods. If the value of the cotton be \$1,000, Smith buys of a London bank a draft on a New York bank for \$1,000, which he mails to Jones. That completes the transaction between Jones and Smith, Smith's bank account being reduced by \$1,000. Smith manufactures the cotton into cloth and ships \$1,000 worth to a New York importer, who buys of the New York bank a draft on the London bank for \$1,000, which he sends to Smith. When Smith deposits his draft his bank account is restored, and the London bank holds a claim of \$1,000 against the New York bank, while the New York bank holds a claim to the same amount against the London bank. The transactions are then equalized, none of the parties in fact owing anything to any of the others.

In practice, of course, the drafts will be on different banks, and from different banks; but that makes no difference, since London nevertheless owes New York \$1,000 and New York owes London \$1,000, a mutual indebtedness which may be utilized for further transactions.

(5) If, in the illustration given, Jones had sent \$1,500 worth of cotton goods to New York, instead of \$1,000, that transaction would have left a balance of \$500 against us, to be equalized either by reverse differences of the value on other exchanges or by a consignment of gold to the value of \$500. If the gold was sent, it would be used for English coinage or for English manufacturing, or it would be shipped from England to some other country to which England was indebted.

But while a balance of trade might exist for some time for or against us relatively to England, it could not long exist relatively to the whole world. Exports and imports constantly tend to balance. This is sometimes made to appear otherwise by treating gold as something different from other commodities. Thus, if Australia shipped large quantities of gold for a long time, it might be said that the balance of trade was perpetually against Australia; but that would not be true, for gold is a product. The tendency to balance is also overcome by rents, interest on watered bonds, dividends on watered stock, and gifts sent from one country to another.

The clearing house of a large city is as good a representation in miniature of the world's exchanges as you can probably find.

(6) Edited selections may be published.

The Single Tax and Wages.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—(1) Do you intend to tax church lands as much as land owned by individuals?

(2) If a machine is invented and throws men out of employment, will not competition reduce wages as much under the single tax as at present?

(3) What kind of a currency does Mr. George propose to have?

(4) If we should have the single tax in this country, would not labor flow in from other countries and reduce wages to what they were before?

H. E. FIELD.

(1) Yes. There is no reason why the community should support a religious sect. Let each sect support itself. If it is rich enough to occupy a block at the head of Wall street on Broadway, paying as much to the community for the privilege as business men must pay for similar locations, let it do so; but if it is too poor to pay taxes, let it build on land that has no value and which, consequently, is not taxed.

(2) No. It will increase wages. Private ownership of land is the netter mill stone, and invention of the upper, between which labor is crushed. The single tax will remove the netter stone. Machinery presses down wages now, because natural opportunities to work are limited, and tend to still greater limitation with the advance of invention. But under the single tax the only limitation of these opportunities would be their actual use. All natural opportunities not in actual use would be free. And since it is the tendency of machinery to broaden the field of employment, a tendency now held in check by land speculation, a machine that threw men out of employment would, if the single tax were in force, only throw them into other more agreeable and more profitable employment.

(3) I do not know that he proposes any particular kind. You will find his views on the subject of money in "Protection or Free Trade?"

(4) Labor would flow in, but instead of reducing wages, every new comer would add to the common wealth. Just as immigration is now a good thing; for landlords, so would it then be for the people.

An Illustration for I. V. P.

BROCKWAYVILLE, Pa.—As affording apt illustrations of the truth of your answer to I. V. P. in THE STANDARD of March 24, I may say that in this section there is plenty of timber land which sells at \$20 an acre, but is assessed at only \$2 for tax purposes. And much land that could not be bought at \$20, but is held at a much higher valuation—such as coal lands, worth from \$50 to \$300 an acre—is assessed at the same \$2 rate.

BION H. BUTLER.

Notes.

"A STUDIOUS INQUIRER," Philadelphia.—The statements which seem to you contradictory are not so. They are different forms of stating the same fact; and though they might fairly appear to be contradictory to one so unfamiliar with the subject that every qualification must be expressed to enable him to understand the limitations of a proposition, yet to a *studious inquirer* their consistency ought to be apparent. Selling value, speculation eliminated, is a capitalization of present rental value; and when speculation pre-

ters in the selling value (as capitalization of prospective rental value). But as vacant land transactions in the market are almost exclusively selling and buying rather than renting transactions, men who invest in land feel respecting these investments as they do respecting investments in other property, that the income from them must approximate to the ordinary rate of interest. Accordingly, I am not disposed to apologize for having said that when the owner of land rents it "he expects a rental based on" the market price, even though I also said that selling value is based on rental value.

In writing the above I have described land as "property" if you look over the files of THE STANDARD you will find that I have frequently said that land is not and cannot be property. I trust you will not call me to account for this inconsistency also.

If you do not see that the single tax will open natural opportunities which are now closed, I cannot undertake to make it clear to you. Read "Progress and Poverty," and "Protection or Free Trade?" and if you do not see it then, you had better conclude that to you the cat is invisible and your efforts in behalf of the single tax have been exerted in a cause which you do not understand and possibly could not believe in.

JOHN C. DANA, Greenwood Springs, Col.—Your suggestion will be acted upon.

LOUIS F. POST.

A GLIMPSE OF TOMBS METHODS.

Mr. Warden Walsh's Bill for Producing a Prisoner in Court—A Little Master of 1,450 Per Cent Overcharge.

Mr. Fatty Walsh—his baptismal name is not really Fatty, but no one would recognize him were his proper first name used—Mr. Fatty Walsh is a local statesman of that class which in England looks to the honor of knighthood as its highest reward. Being an American and not an Englishman, Mr. Walsh has secured a more substantial guardian for his political services. He has become warden of the Tombs prison in New York, with seigniorial rights of which no man has ever seen the complete list. He furnishes prisoners with extra food, supplies messengers to run their errands and otherwise relaxes the rigor of his official hospitality; all of course, for due consideration. Take it all in all, the honorable Fatty Walsh is considered by Tombs habitués and cognoscenti to have a pretty soft thing.

The best of men, however, have their troubles, and Mr. Walsh has his. He is in trouble now. Undeservedly, of course. He is being persecuted.

On March 23, Judge Cullen, of the supreme court, then sitting in Brooklyn, issued a writ directing Mr. Fatty Walsh to produce before him the body of John D. Watson, then a prisoner in the Tombs, to give evidence in certain litigation. Mr. Walsh respectfully bowed to the mandate of the law, and sent Mr. Watson to Brooklyn in a carriage under charge of two keepers. Then he sent to George R. Rhodes, Jr., the lawyer who had obtained the writ, a bill made up of the following items:

Carriage hire.....\$10 00
Two keepers at \$7.50..... 15 00
Ferryage..... 24
Total.....\$25 24

Mr. Rhodes thought this bill excessive. He didn't complain about the charge for ferryage, and he was even willing to stand the hack hire; but he felt there was a misunderstanding about the keepers. He hadn't wanted to pay for the limited time necessary to get to Brooklyn, attend court and return. Evidently Mr. Fatty Walsh had misunderstood matters. And so Mr. Rhodes, after vainly endeavoring to induce Fatty's representative to accept a reasonable sum, submitted the bill to the court, and learned that Mr. Walsh's complete legal fee was two dollars.

Then Mr. Walsh went to his desk in magnanimous indignation, and wrote Mr. Rhodes a letter. "I require," he said, "the full amount of my bill as presented by my keepers, \$25.24. If you do not choose to pay it, I will take no further notice in the matter, but make you a present of the bill." And then came this very significant postscript: "You need not ask any more favors from me."

So Mr. Rhodes sent the correspondence to Mayor Hewitt, and Mayor Hewitt sent it to the commissioners of charities and correction, and the commissioners of charities and correction called on the honorable Fatty Walsh, warden of the Tombs, for a report. And the honorable Fatty made a report as requested, setting forth that everything was quite correct—that the ruling price of keepers was \$10, whereas he had charged only \$7.50, explaining that the charge for carriage hire was very moderate, and offering to prove the ferryage.

And so the matter rests for the present. The honorable Fatty Walsh says he is out \$20.24 for carriage hire and ferryage; the keepers are out \$7.50 each, which Mr. Walsh says he would have paid them if Mr. Rhodes had paid him; and Mr. George R. Rhodes, Jr., is in pocket to the extent of \$2. Mr. Walsh's legal fee. The whole affair is a glimpse of Tombs methods. Drop the curtain.

The Rent Beneficiaries of the Lumber Drive.

Frederick, Wisconsin in Philadelphia Record.

When the Williamsport lumbermen went to Washington to prevail on the committee having in charge the bill now before congress to retain the duty on lumber, they were sent by laboring men. Does any one imagine that the wages of the log chopper or the mill hand? The men who convert the standing lumber into manufactured lumber are not allowed to share in the Canadian log chopper's long enough to know that the duty on lumber forms no part of his wages. The particular kind of labor he has to sell comes in competition with all other kinds of labor, including foreign labor. If the removal of the duty from lumber would lower the price of lumber, it would reduce the value of stumpage; and who could better afford to stand a reduction of stumpage than the log chopper, who bought his pine timber at fifty cents and sold it for \$1 per 1000 feet on the stump. The only effect the reduction in the price of lumber would have on the laboring man would be to reduce the cost of the house that shelters himself and family.

History Repeats Itself.

Green's History of the English People.

Monopolies abandoned by Elizabeth, extinguished by act of parliament under James, and denounced with the assent of Charles himself in the petition of right, were again set on foot, and on a scale far more gigantic than had been seen before. . . . Wine, soap, salt, and almost every article of domestic use, fell into the hands of monopolists, and rose in price out of the hands of the people, and the profit gained by the crown "they say in our cup." Colpepper said afterward in the song "Parliament," "They dip in our dish, they sit by our fire, we find them in the dye, they wash bowls and the powdering tub. They shave with the cutter in his box. They have marked and sealed us from head to foot."

Protection for Pennsylvania Coal Spills the Market for Western Coal.

Chicago Tribune.

Birmingham coal should go on the free list. All New England could then get cheaper fuel than it now gets from Pennsylvania, Nova Scotia, and the Canadian railway tariff on coal would be repealed, thus opening a new field of export to the coal operators of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.

EVENTS IN ENGLAND AND AUSTRALIA.

At last the bitter cry of outcast London has reached the ears of the nation's masters assembled at St. Stephen's. Lord Dufferin, stocked with facts and figures, arose from his bench in the house of lords the other night and called for a consideration of the "sweating system" prevailing at the east end. He said that the conditions of the lives of many of the people there "are more deplorable than those of any body of workmen in any portion of the civilized world." As an illustration of his assertion, he stated that among the women engaged in making waistcoats he had found one machinist who could earn only 5s. per week by working from 7 in the morning till 12 or 1 next morning. In the manufacture of children's clothes, he found one woman who made knickerbockers for 15d. a pair, and could earn 6s. 6d. per week. "It is not strange," said he, "that under such circumstances women are driven on the streets, and that the strongest men are killed in the course of eight or ten years."

The whole assembly was thunderstruck at the revelation, and one after another noble lords got up and poured forth eloquence and pathos. One found consolation in the fact that "the great majority of these unfortunate people are not our fellow subjects, but are foreigners, Scotch and persons of other nationalities. They landed in this country in absolute destitution."

But what was to be done? The London Star said rightly that the discussion "suggests much the same kind of feeling as would be aroused by a convention of cannibals meeting to discuss the prevention of hasty mastication." These privileged persons had no intention of really changing the condition of things, for upon those conditions the continuance of the luxuries which they enjoyed depended. Besides, quoted one, "if these classes are entirely swept away there is danger of trade being driven away." But there was a way out of the difficulty they were well agreed, and the discussion dwindled down to a plea for protection. "Men and women," cried Lord Dufferin, "have to work eighteen hours a day for merely starvation wages; women are driven to a life of dishonor, as being less degraded than the circumstances which attend a life of honest toil," because of that "free competition which political economists tell us is so beneficial." Consequently, competition from abroad must be cut off by rearing up a wall of duties, the virtue of which is that the price of products would rise and opportunity be given to increase rents, or at all events to prevent their decline.

And well may the noble lords speak eloquently in this cause. They are driven hard. From every quarter come disarming reports. Rents shrieking and all kinds of schemes afoot to cause their further shrinkage—chief among them a plan to shift upon rents the burden of those taxes that have for so long hampered industry. In the Scottish highlands, and in Ireland, commissioners are chopping down the rent of the tenant, and the financial reform association, in conjunction with the Scottish land restoration league, has just passed resolutions to the effect that "unless provision be made in the imperial budget for the repeal of the duties upon tea, coffee, cocoa, chicory, dried fruits, gold and silver plate, and the tax upon carriages, the sense of the house (parliament) be taken as to the abolition of such duties and the substitution of a tax upon land values."

In London the rate committee of the Lambeth vestry recommends the taxation of ground rents for the purpose of public improvements and suggests that other metropolitan vestries do likewise. Influential newspapers, such as the *Star*, the *Pall Mall Gazette* and *Reynolds's Weekly*, are blazing away for gradual absorption of rents for public purposes. Clergymen and lay speakers are everywhere urging the same thing. Members of parliament are working for it in the house of commons and candidates are advocating it upon the hustings. Here, there and everywhere the cry is raised against landlords' confiscation of the products of the workers' toil. It is not the hot heads and cool heads and respected "philanthropists" who are crying for the abolition of ground rents, but the cry is not a hot bed of socialism or even of radicalism, says the *London Echo*. "On the contrary, conservatives largely preponderate in its representative bodies, yet here the proposal to levy a direct impost upon the owners of property (land) receives general support."

Moreover, at the instance of William Saunders, one of the most persistent advocates of the single tax doctrine, when the Walworth liberals and radicals propose to place the land under the next vacancy, the London vestry is preparing to tax the ground rents and values. It is preparing to place a statement of the doctrine in the hands of every elector in the metropolis. The statement will be issued in the form of a thirty-two-page pamphlet. A thousand dollars toward defraying the expense of this undertaking was guaranteed at the first meeting, and further subscriptions have since been supplied. Such a document in the hands of thinking people, even if supplemented by no greater public discussion than that which is now going on in press, on platform and in pulpit, must be productive of great good, and will bring into the ranks of the new crusade hundreds, perhaps thousands, of strong hands and sturdy hearts.

But the climax of assault against the peers was reached in the big vote in the commons in favor of reform in the house of lords. True, the Tory vote outnumbered that of radicals and liberals, but the subject is one that is persistently coming up, and each time the evidence is weaker and the assaults more audacious. Excepting a few men like Lord Salisbury, Earl Spencer and Lord Rosebery, who foresee the social crash, and are prepared to stand from under, the five hundred gentlemen who constitute the house of lords are strongly prejudiced against the rising tide of democracy, and whenever a popular measure comes up they leave pigeon matches, race courses, prize fights and gambling bets to vote against it. And now John Morley gives the climax of ingratitude toward these saviors of British society by declaring that "the accident of birth can no longer count for anything in making laws for a free and self-governing people."

This sentiment is ominous, indeed, for, carried out to its logical end, it puts an end to royalty itself, and sweeps the land clear for the establishment of a republic.

The London *Christian Commonwealth*, in a recent editorial, says:

It was no part of God's arrangement that millions of poor men and women—aye, and children, too—should be working their fingers to the bone and living on bread and water in order to fill the pockets of a few thousand people, who stand behind them to appropriate the fruits of their labor. No; this is not of God; no sanction can be found for it in the scriptures; and the voice of God which speaks to every man through his conscience and his reason, condemns it as treason against primary human rights.

The *Christian Commonwealth* announces

that a conference of Christian men and women will shortly be held in London to make a move toward securing recognition of these human rights and to meet Cardinal Manning's question, "What is society doing, or willing to do, to redeem and save the worthless?" Of what the *Christian Commonwealth* is in favor there can be no question, as it is a staunch advocate of the single tax and gives large space to its columns to the propagation of anti-poverty gospel.

The closeness with which the interests of Australia are linked to those of Great Britain in the great social struggle, and the radical sentiments that are abroad in Australia, may be seen by the following extract from the Brisbane (Australia) *Boomerang*, commenting on the agitation in the Highlands of Scotland and the scheme of wholesale deportation of crofters to Australia. "What permanent good will it do them to 'come to Australia'?" asks the *Boomerang*.

Will it not be simply dropping them from the clutches of one land robber into the clutches of another? And if the latter robber, our own Australian landlord, does not yet squeeze quite so tightly as his British prototype it is only because the monopoly is not yet quite complete and because he is obliged to be a little reasonable until it is. The crofter holds the winning hand in Scotland. He's got the land; he's got the case; and he's got a mighty dollop of public indignation downing the land robbers before his eyes, but bearing him safe and sound upon its upmost crest. The *Turres Vetrus* of the British land monopoly, the *Highlands* of the Irish people, Scotland, that Edinburgh jury which acquitted the Lewis deer raiders, has declared itself for reform. The English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged the gulf of national hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoils. If he comes here, there'll be a new year's festivity; and then the same old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who would for reform the English radicals have bridged

THE STANDARD.

SENEY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
11 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers in every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

GENERAL BRYCE'S CAFE.

General Lloyd S. Bryce, having considered the question of land nationalization, publishes a confession in the *North American Review*. He is embarrassed at the thought of the cow which has done duty so often to illustrate one phase of opposition to land reforms, as the blacksmith shop alongside the palace has for another phase. But General Bryce does not call it a cow; he calls it a calf.

If the principle that man must not monopolize what his own labor has not created prohibits private ownership of land, General Bryce wants to know if, it does not also "interdict private ownership in a calf." And General Bryce is a member of congress!

The economic identity of land and cows, or, if you please, calves, has been often asserted and the fallacy and absurdity of the proposition as often exposed; but for the purpose of observing a congressman's mental machinery in full operation it may be instructive as well as entertaining, despite the danger of dizziness, to follow General Bryce through this little exercise of his in economic gyrations.

"God," he says, "made the calf as well as he did the land," the inference being that man has no more right to absolute ownership of calves than to absolute ownership of land. That God made calves as well as land is true, just as it is true that God made the rainwater which the housewife collects in her tub as well as the clouds from which it falls or the sea from which it evaporated. And in the same sense it is true that God made houses, locomotives, ships and dry goods as well as land. But for certain natural laws which man may direct, but can neither originate nor control, he could have none of these. No matter how much labor he expended he could not collect a drop of water nor produce any inanimate thing but for laws of cohesion; and if he could it would float away into space but for laws of gravitation; and but for laws of generation calves would not be born. But given these and other natural laws, and man may produce ships, houses, locomotives, dry goods or calves at will; and if he direct his labor exclusively to the production of any one, the others will disappear. It is just as much on account of human labor that the supply of calves and cows is maintained as that ships and houses are produced and preserved. But not so with land, the source of all these things, and the ultimate governor of their production; no labor can make it, no labor can increase it, no lack of labor can diminish it. Land is, as it always has been and always will be, the source of life, the mother of wealth, upon which we must live and in which we must deliver; to be denied it is a sentence of death, to be compelled to buy it a sentence into slavery.

A perfect calf syndicate could subject us to temporary inconvenience, but a perfect land syndicate would reduce us to servitude. General Bryce might do very well with land, even if he could get no calf to put upon it; but what would he do with his calf if he could get no land to put the calf upon?

Since man is an earthing and not a calding, unless members of congress be excepted, there is all the difference of life and death or slavery and freedom between monopoly of land and monopoly of calves; and since all that is drawn forth from the earth is drawn forth by man's labor, while the earth itself is as it came from the hand of omnipotence, there is all the difference of title by production and title by force between ownership of land and ownership of calves.

"The calf grows," says General Bryce, "and with its growth its value is enhanced," and "the calf costs its owner no more in proportion to bring up than it costs the land owner to bring up his land." It is well to remember that General Bryce is a member of congress, for in the supposition that membership in that body implies a moderate amount of intelligence, the fact would never be suspected from this observation. What if the value of a calf does grow with its growth? Does the value of land grow with its growth? And who ever heard before of land owners "bringing up" land? The land had attained its full growth long before any land owner appeared to say to his fellow man: "This is mine! work for me or get you gone!" What Congressman Bryce probably means by "bringing up" land, is improving it. But if he does mean that, he wanders from the question, for it is not asserted that the value of improvements do not belong to the producer, but that the value

of the place improved does not belong to the appropriator. Land with a house on it is worth more than without a house, and the difference belongs to the builder. Land fertilized is worth more than if not fertilized, and the difference belongs to the cultivator. Land so favorably located that ten thousand men want it is worth more than land so unfavorably located that no man wants it; but the difference does not belong to the appropriator. In those cases the owner has earned the difference; in this he has not.

The "unearned increment" of the cow General Bryce finds to be her milk; and let him beware who would intimate that the milk has been earned by the owner of the cow who has fed her on the produce of his fields, for General Bryce is ready with a reply that "if the land does not belong to him, neither does the produce of the land." General Bryce, it will be seen, has an airy way, learned in congressional committees, perhaps, of disposing of such trifles as the distinction between land from which labor produces and the things that labor produces.

Is it any wonder that the influence of the metropolis is so slight in congress? Here is a prominent representative from this city to a body which legislates upon economic subjects for a whole nation, who publicly confesses that he cannot distinguish between calves and land, between the value that comes from the growth of a calf and that which comes from the growth of population, between power to produce land and power to produce land products, between purchase of pieces of Ireland and purchase of Irish pigs; a representative who from sheer ignorance of the distinction would as soon confiscate men's cattle as repeal parliament titles which have vested "the land of the free" in a part of their number, and discounted the labor of unborn generations.

Verily a tariff agitation is needed, if for no other reason than that some members of congress may be taught to take a primary lesson or two in political economy.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE WORLD.

Volapuk (in the pronunciation of which, by the way, o is sounded as in "roll," a as in father, u with a dexterous intermingling of oo and e, and the accent is on the last syllable), is the new language invented by Father Schleyer, a German priest, of which we are just beginning to hear. Its students claim for it that it not only meets all the requirements of a universal language, but is rapidly being accepted as such. It was first published in 1879, but made no progress until 1882, and very little until 1884. In the former year it spread into Austria, and in the latter into Holland and Belgium. In 1885 it was extensively studied in France, and in the following year in Sweden, Denmark and Russia. It is still almost unknown in the United States, but there are over one hundred influential societies on the continent of Europe devoted to its propagation. Eleven periodicals, including a humorous paper, are published in the language; its bibliography comprises nearly one hundred books in about a dozen languages; two general assemblies have been held by its scholars, and there is an academy to govern its development.

It was the aim of the inventor of Volapuk to devise a clear and accurate method of expressing thought, and to make the language as easy as possible to learn. In this he has been, so far as it is possible to judge without a thorough knowledge of the subject, completely successful. Respecting ease of acquisition, his success is demonstrated. Three or four weeks of moderate study will qualify a student to translate readily within the limits of his vocabulary, though a great deal of practice will, of course, be necessary to give fluency either in writing or speaking.

The most difficult part of the study of Volapuk is the memorization of the alphabet, which, to the English student, is not very difficult either, for all the letters have the English form, and excepting the vowels and three consonants the English sounds; but from this point there is a logical simplicity of structure that makes the study as fascinating and almost as easy as the reading of a novel.

After learning the vowels, a few minutes' study will enable one to count without limit. Each of the digits is simply a vowel sandwiched between two consonants; the tens are the plural of the digits, indicated by the addition of s; there is one simple word for "hundred" and another for "thousand" and from that on radical changes in numeration are indicated by the addition of *ion* to the digits and tens. Thus: *bal* is one and *tel* is two; *bals* is ten and *telts* is twenty; *balsbal* (ten-and-one) is eleven, and *teltsel* (twenty-and-two) is twenty-two; *tum* being hundred, *balium* is one hundred, and *telium* is two hundred; *nul* being thousand, *balnul* is one thousand; *balion* is million, *bal balion* is one million, and *tel balion* is two millions, while *telion* is billion, and so on. All variations in numbers have this basis. For example, "second" is *telid*, "twice" is *telidna*, and "the second time" is *telidna*. The months of the year and the days of the week, being enumerated, are also based upon the cardinal numbers. Month being *nul*, the first month, or January, is *Balid*, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*.The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, or for impersonal, as in the sentence "it snows," and *on* for collective, as in the sentence "they say" or "one would be embarrassed." The plural in each instance is indicated by the addition of *s*, a feature so uniform that all nouns and pronouns ending in *s* are certainly plural. A similar feature is the adoption of the Englishword "she," spelled *ji*, as a prefix for the feminine; thus, sister is "she brother," lady is "she sir," wife is "she husband." Adjectives are formed by adding *ik* to the noun, and adverbs by adding *o*, corresponding to the English *ly*; while degrees of comparison for both adverbs and adjectives are indicated by the syllable *um* before *o* in adverbs and after *ik* in adjectives for comparative, and by *un* for superlative.The tense signs are vowel prefixes for the active voice and the same vowels preceded by the consonant *p* for the passive. The indicative mood is the root word with the appropriate pronoun affixed. The infinitive, the participle, the imperative and the potential are indicated by suffixes; the subjunctive is the indicative preceded by the word *if*, meaning "if." In connection with the subjunctive is the conditional mood with its peculiar sign, as "if I were well" (subjunctive), "I would visit you" (conditional).The interrogative, formed in English by transposition, is in Volapuk indicated by the syllable *li* placed before or after the verb and united to it by a hyphen. There are also the frequentative prefix, to indicate habitual action, as "I read, or 'I eat'" and the reflexive suffix, expressing action upon the actor, as "I clothe myself," or "he washes himself."

This is a complete description of the skeleton of the language. There are conjunctions and prepositions to learn, as well as order of words, idiomatic expressions, methods of deriving and compounding words, and the vocabulary. But the principles are so simple and the processes so logical and regular that there are no arbitrary rules to observe and, except in learning root words, very little memorizing to do.

As an example of derivation something like sixty modifications of the word "language" are given by Mr. Sprague in his primer, all having that word for the principal root and being derived from it in accordance with principles so simple and regular that the student could make most of the modifications without reference to the dictionary if he knew the meaning of the root words. To illustrate with the term *volapuk* itself. It is a compound word, the principal root being *pukon*, to speak. Dropping the sign of the infinitive we have the noun *puk*, speech or language. The modifying root is *vol*, meaning world, to which is added *a*, the sign of the possessive case. The combination therefore is "world's speech" or "world's language," which is translated "universal language."An example of derivation and compounding of curious interest to American readers is the noun, "The United States." In Volapuk it is *Peballats*. The student of Volapuk about to translate this for the first time notices the sign of the passive voice in the initial *p*, and of the perfect tense in the following letter *e*. That is, *pe*, as a verb prefix, invariably indicates the perfect tense of the passive voice. From this the student knows that something has been done to something, which suggests to him that the next syllable, *bal*, must be a verb instead of the numeral "one," which is spelled in the same way, and being a verb its infinitive must be *balon*. He turns to his dictionary and finding that *balon*, derived from *bal*, meaning "one," signifies "to unite," he knows that something has been united. Passing then to the next syllable, "tats," which by its plural terminal warns him that the word to search for is "tat," he finds it to mean "states." Thus the translation of the whole word comes to him in the phrase "states which have been united." But as this phrase is in Volapuk a single word and that a noun, and especially as it is capitalized, he knows that a particular nation, government or confederation is alluded to, and his knowledge of geography may suggest the United States of America; but he cannot be certain that this country is meant, except from the context or unless the word *Melop*, "America," with the possessive suffix *a* follows. The United States of America, therefore, would be in Volapuk *Peballats Melopa*, a literal translation of which is "America's states [which] have been united."

The importance of this invented language cannot be overestimated. It is already in somewhat extensive use abroad in commercial circles, and is attracting the attention of literary circles there; while in New York, where it is scarcely known, Charles E. Sprague, its principal student here, is authority for the statement that business houses are often in receipt of Volapuk letters from foreign correspondents. It is in commerce no doubt that the language will be in earliest and most active demand; but it cannot be general in commerce without extending beyond commercial limits, and at no distant day becoming what it is intended to be, a universal medium of thought between peoples of different speech, to be spoken in every household and taught in every school along with the mother tongue. What Latin is to the priest and French to the diplomat, Volapuk promises to become to the common people; and, developing, as it undoubtedly will, under the impulse of general use, but in accordance with its simple and regular laws of construction, it may even supersede Latin in the intercourse of ecclesiastics and French in diplomacy. However that may be, its adoption by the people will tear down another insurmountable barrier between nations, and by community in expression promote community in thought and brotherhood in intercourse.

Volapuk is essentially a free trade device, and as such demands immediate and earnest attention from protectionists. But it is one of the kind of devices that free trade every now and then puts forth, like

the steamship and the electric cable, with which protectionists find tariff laws utterly inefficient to cope. With greyhounds on the sea and cables under the sea, and a world's language easy to learn and regular and limitless in development, strangers to one another will become so neighborly that nothing can make them hostile but walls which they will not build and guns which they will neither construct nor use.

LOUIS F. POST.

A MACHINE THAT WILL EARN A SALARY.

The typewriting machine and the stenographer have within the last few years effected a revolution in the methods of mercantile correspondence. Formerly a house engaged in an extensive business was compelled to have in its service a corps of skilled correspondents—men who not only knew how to write good commercial English, but who were conversant with the details of the business of the firm. A good corresponding clerk in those days was seldom out of employment, and a clerk who made himself master of some special line of business, who could express ideas tersely, yet in good English, and who wrote a rapid, good commercial hand, was sure of advancement. If his own employer did not raise his salary, some commercial competitor was sure to snap him up at an advance.

Then the typewriting machine came to the front, and with it the stenographer. Business men learned by degrees the convenience and security of having their letters written in their own very words, and in words chosen while the matters under discussion were fresh in their minds. The corresponding clerk no longer needed any knowledge of the business—save, perhaps, a few technical terms of trade—but could write a letter which might be perfectly intelligible to the merchant dictating it and to its recipient without conveying any very definite ideas to the stenographer. This was an advantage. It enabled the head of a great business to hold the reins more firmly in his own grasp and assured him against the risk that a discharged clerk could take away with him any valuable trade secrets. An hour or two of work each morning, with a stenographer at his elbow, enabled a merchant to read and answer his entire mail, and left him free for the other duties of the day.

Gradually it was found that a new field of industry had opened up for women. They made better stenographers and type writers than men. Their ignorance of commercial affairs was a merit rather than a fault. Above all, they were willing to work more cheaply. Tens of thousands of young women learned the business, secured comfortable situations and were independent. But the demand has grown faster than the supply. A good stenographer and type writer need now never be out of a situation, and wages are well maintained, if they are not actually rising. The old-time corresponding clerk has disappeared. So far as his special vocation is concerned he has been forced downward into the great army of unskilled labor. He makes no complaint. It wouldn't help him if he did.

But if the stories told of Professor Bell and Mr. Edison are true, the young lady stenographer is doomed to the fate of the corresponding clerk. The graphophone will soon be an applicant for her situation, and will be pretty apt to get it. For the graphophone will do all that the stenographer and typewriter can do, will do it more rapidly and accurately, and will work for lower wages.

The graphophone is a perfection of the phonograph which Edison invented years ago. It is an instrument smaller than the ordinary typewriting machine, and can be made part of the furniture of any ordinary desk. When you want to write a letter all you need do is to place a little cylinder in position, start a clock work moving and whisper what you want to say into the graphophone's ear. When you have finished, take out the cylinder, put it in a specially made envelope, address it to your correspondent and send it off by mail. When the correspondent gets it he puts it in his graphophone, starts his clock work and listens while the instrument repeats your message word for word and tone for tone. Then the little cylinder can be filed away and kept for years, ready at any time to repeat its remarks in an office or before a jury.

Graphophones, it is said, will not be offered for sale. Nobody can buy one. They will work for a salary, just as the young lady stenographers do now, and as the corresponding clerks of former days used to. Only, as they can get along without eating, wear no clothes, have no taste for theater or church, and don't need to go home at night to sleep, they can afford to work for a great deal less than their flesh and blood competitors. Sixty dollars a year is the salary named for an efficient graphophone of good moral character and strictly attentive to business. On these terms, we are informed, one thousand graphophones will shortly be seeking situations. There will be no competition. The graphophone that isn't hired will not go round hunting for a job and offering to take another graphophone's place at a lower salary. It will stay perfectly quiet, incurring no expense, wasting no vital force, worried by no apprehension of coming destitution, assailed by no temptation, until somebody wants it. In this respect the graphophone has a great advantage over the young women whom it is trying to displace.

There is a lawsuit—so the papers say—behind the graphophone. But it will not injure the graphophone's prospects. Quite the contrary. It is a lawsuit between Mr. Edison and Professor Bell, to decide the

question of who first invented the graphophone. But the verdict is reported to have been discounted. Mr. Edison is to have the same share of ownership whether the courts decide for him or against him. So is Professor Bell. Why, then, should the lawsuit be continued? Simply, it is whispered, for the sake of the free advertising it will secure.

Thus invention advances, and man gains more and more the mastery over nature. As machinery replaces hands, and skilled labor becomes less and less needful, the cost of production and distribution is lessened and things can be sold cheaper and cheaper. It will be a consolation for the female type writer to reflect upon this when she loses her situation and finds herself face to face with—well, say starvation only.

ALIEN LANDLORDS.

The committee on the revision of the laws has submitted to the house a bill declaring "all foreign persons who have not been naturalized incapable of taking the title to lands anywhere within the United States, except a leasehold for not exceeding five years." In the accompanying report the committee say they have ascertained "with reasonable certainty, that certain noblemen of Europe, principally Englishmen, have acquired, and now own, about 21,000,000 acres of land within the United States." The committee says it has not sufficient information to state the quantity of land owned by untitled aliens, nor does it consider that important. Why it is any worse for American citizens to have an alien nobleman for a landlord than to have an alien commoner it does not explain. Nor do they go to the ranks of the British nobility for examples of the wicked alien landlord. They of course bring up the case of Lord Scully, but disrespectfully refer to him as "a Mr. Scully, who lives in England and is a subject of the queen." They also refer to the Schenley estate in Pittsburgh, "from which the Schenleys, who are subjects of the British queen, draw annually not less than \$100,000 rental;" but they do not state that this Schenley estate got into the hands of "subjects of the British queen" by the marriage of an American girl to an Englishman.

Of the manner in which our railroad grants may result in alien landlords they say:

The avarice and enterprise of European capitalists have caused them to invest many millions in American railroad and land bonds, covering perhaps 100,000,000 acres, the greater part of which under foreclosure sales will most likely before many years become the property of these foreign bondholders in addition to their present princely possessions. This aggressive foreign capital is not confined to lands it has purchased, but overlapping its boundaries has caused hundreds of miles of the public domain to be fenced up for the grazing of vast herds of cattle, and set at defiance the rights of the honest but humble settlers.

Since the bill is not retroactive it is hard to see how it can affect these avaricious foreign capitalists without depriving them of rights which attach to them by virtue of their purchase of American bonds.

This bill, in its discrimination against aliens, is utterly unworthy of the great republic. But its introduction and the accompanying report are gratifying evidences of the growth of the sentiment which questions the right of any man to compel another man to pay tribute to him for the use of the natural elements necessary to all. The attempt to prevent aliens in future from acquiring title to American land is merely a tub to the whale. Alien landlords yet to be, have no friends, and American landlordism is ready to throw them over in the hope that that may quiet the rising sentiment. But it will not.

If free trade is right then the emancipation of the American colonies was an economic blunder. England would have given them all the free trade they desired.

That is what Van Buren Denslow said in his address on "The Protective Tariff," before the Republican club of this city, April 2, 1888.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation: For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

That is what the continental congress said in their Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

Let facts be submitted to a candid world.

The protectionists are complaining that it is the intention to make William L. Scott of Pennsylvania chairman of the national democratic committee in place of W. H. Barnum. If the democrats get rid of Barnum they will get rid of an incubus. His place, like that of Randall, is in the republican party.

The condition of the great subsidies in lands and bonds granted to the Union, Central and Northern Pacific railroads was that they should build and operate telegraph lines as well as railroads to the Pacific, and it was provided that these telegraph lines should be open to all who wished to use them for the transmission of news or messages. The three companies, however, made a contract with the Western Union by which they have carried its messages exclusively, thus giving it an entire monopoly of transcontinental telegraphing, until two years ago the Postal telegraph company secured the use of the telegraph lines of the Canadian Pacific, and by building a special line through Washington territory, Oregon and northern California, managed to reach San Francisco. But in all the country between the terminal points of the three American subsidized roads the Western Union still has an absolute monopoly.

The house, with but four negative votes, recently passed a bill to compel the railroad companies to obey the law, and it is now in the senate. If passed—and it will pass if that portion of the press not under the influence of the Western Union give any publicity to the matter—it will compel the railroad companies to accept messages from the postal company or "any other opposition that may be started, on the same terms as from the Western Union. The four members who voted against the bill in the house were all representatives of New York. They were S. V. White, republican, of Brooklyn; A. M. Bliss, democrat, of Brooklyn; John H. Ketcham, of Dover Plains, New York, republican, and T. A. Merriman, *Sun* democrat, of New York.

Misled by an erroneous news report, THE STANDARD last week criticised the ballot bill reported by the judiciary committee of the assembly. Correct reports from Albany show that the bill as reported is one that ought to be passed. That feature of the bill to which we objected was the reputed omission to provide for independent nominations; but such nominations are provided for. The conventions of any party which cast three per cent of the vote at the preceding election is entitled to have the names of its nominees printed on the official ballots, and the names of independent candidates are placed on the ballot upon the petition of electors equal in number to one per cent of the vote at the preceding election, no more than one thousand signatures being required in any case. As the proposed law is not to take effect until next year, there seems to be reason to hope that it may pass.

A FUNNY STORY THAT POINTS A SERIOUS MORAL.

New York Tribune.

A large man of most dignified appearance and generally clerical attire stopped at a small apartment house in Twenty-ninth street and rang one of the fourth floor bells.

"Who is it?" called a shrill voice through the tube.

"In the clergyman, madame. I am making a few parish calls this morning and I thought I'd stop a moment. Please open the door."

"Well, it's time you came," replied the shrill voice. "The condensed milk you brought yesterday was stale, and the vinegar you've been blowing about as so fine has been working until it blew the stopper out of the cruet. I think your grocery is a fraud."

The clerical ear at the street end of the tube heard this reply in speechless surprise and then he called up earnestly: "You've made a mistake, madame; I am the clergyman. If you are busy I will call again."

"Butcher's man!" she asked doubtfully.

"Clergyman?" bawled out the reverend gentleman in the doorway.

"Well, I'm glad you've come yourself instead of sending the man. My husband says if you send us any more old sheep for spring lamb he'll go around and break your head with one of the chops. Come up stairs, I want to see you."

But the clerical gentleman was gone, and he hurried up Sixth avenue as rapidly as if the irate husband, chops in hand, was on his track.

GETTING READY TO BUY SOME MORE UNITED STATES.

New York Tribune.

A syndicate of English capitalists recently sent R. Henderson, a Scotch iron expert, to this country to examine the coal and iron fields of the south. He has been here about three months, during which time he has made a thorough investigation of iron mining, and also given much study to economic and trade conditions. In a brief talk yesterday he said:

"It appears to me that the conditions of your trade internally are excellent. There is good business all over the country, and the tendency of things is to improve. I cannot understand the falling off in the prices of securities in the market except on the theory that there is lack of confidence in the management of properties which are listed on the market. It is general lack of confidence I should say."

"What do you think about making iron in Alabama?"

"Well, there is only one place in all England where they can make iron cheaper than they can make it at the new furnaces about finished at Birmingham."

Argumentum ad Hominem.

Boston Globe.

When Fred D. was six years old, his father and mother took him to the British provinces to spend a summer vacation. When crossing the frontier on the way home the custom house officer passed through the cars examining the baggage of the passengers, to see if it contained anything taxable and break your head with one of the chops. Come up stairs, I want to see you."

Fred was very much interested in this, and his father had to explain to him how any passenger who brings anything new from Canada must pay a tax on it to the officer.

The inspector was just about to leave the car and pass on to the next when Fred, who had been silently reflecting for a few minutes, asked his father, in a shrill voice, that was audible to every one in the car, including the customs examiner:

"Pa, did you pay him for that new overcoat and dress suit you got in Halifax?"

That little exhibition of juvenile cuteness cost his poor pa a \$25 bill. His pa is a free trader now.

Had Enough of It.

Boston Globe.

Little Fred D.—and his father and mother were going to board with a neighbor for two weeks while the house was undergoing repairs. Fred was delighted at the prospects.

"Mamma," he said, "didn't you say I must thank God for every good thing?"

"Yes, Fred."

"Thank I thank him because we are going to board?"

"Yes, if you like."

When the two weeks had expired, and the last dinner at the boarding house had been eaten, Fred leaned back in his chair and heaving a long sigh of relief, said, in the hearing of his hostess:

"Now let's thank God we've got through boarding."

They Would Have Fenced in the Pool of Bethesda.

Cor. St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

The owners of the bath houses at the Arkansas hot springs have formed a hot water trust, by which they are seeking to control all the springs. A regular yearly toll is paid the government for the privilege of bath houses, and the members of the trust have taken up all the available sites, but refuse to build houses on them in order to keep down competition. An auditor of the trust goes around every Monday morning and collects the receipts of the week from all the houses, and after paying expenses the profits are divided among the members.

New York's Death Roll for One Week.

During last week there were reported at the bureau of vital statistics in this city 765 deaths, 635 births and 291 marriages. Of the deaths, 416 were in tenement houses and 105 in public institutions. Of the dead, 294 were children under five years, and 65 were seventy years old and over.

ALL ALONG THE LINE.

HOW THE MOVEMENT FOR INDUSTRIAL EMANCIPATION IS PROGRESSING.

The County General Committee.
The general committee of the United labor party meets at Clarendon hall Thursday evening, April 5.

The difference of opinion among the leaders of the party as to what should be done in the coming campaign is the cause of the general apathy now prevailing among the district organizations. Very few of the clubs are now holding regular meetings, and some of them have given up their headquarters.

The State Committee.
The state committee has been called to meet at the Mansion house, Albany, on Saturday, April 7. The object, as stated in the call, is "to prescribe the method of electing delegates to the national conference of the United labor party, to be held at Cincinnati, May 15, and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the committee." The call is signed by John H. Blakeney, chairman.

Discussing Methods of Propaganda.
A few single tax men assembled at an informal dinner at Pedro's restaurant on Duane street, near Centre, on Thursday evening, March 29, to talk over plans for stimulating the propagation of single tax doctrine. Ben jamin Uner was in the chair, and Louis F. Post, Jerome O'Neill, Walter Carr, E. J. Shriver, Henry George, A. J. Steers and about twenty other gentlemen took part in the proceedings. The drift of opinion seemed to be in favor of the formation of an organization or conducting active personal propaganda on lines similar to the National tax reform association, as described by Mr. H. F. Ring of Texas. After a general expression of opinion a resolution was adopted, declaring that "the chairman of this meeting shall appoint a committee of three to draft a plan of organization, with a name, to be submitted to a future called meeting of this body; and that the said committee shall invite suggestions in writing as to various plans for organization." J. H. Dunlop, Read Gordon and J. L. Dunham were appointed on the committee, and, on motion, the chairman of the meeting, Mr. Uner, was added.

The next meeting will be held at the same place on Friday evening, April 6.

The Brooklyn Tax Reform Club.
BROOKLYN, March 28.—The meeting of this club last evening was enlivened with a discussion of the ethical side of the relation between employers and laborers. Several visitors were present, and took part in the debate and in the informal talk that followed. The next meeting will be held April 11 at Everett hall, Fulton street, near Gallatin place.

Five to Four.
ELIZABETH, N. J.—I was one of nine men in a store here the other night when a vote was taken on the tariff question. The result was four in favor of protection and five for free trade.

THE FREE TRADE REVOLUTION IN PENNSYLVANIA.
Waking up and beginning to ask questions—Resolutions by Blacksmiths and Machinists—Specimens of Letters to the Press.

The yeast is working in Pennsylvania as it never worked before. The experience of the miners, the coke burners and producers generally, has set them to thinking. Soft words butter no parsnips, and men are beginning to discover that the advocates of land monopoly and tariff taxation have nothing but soft words to offer them. Mark L. Roberts, secretary of Henry George club No. 1 of Pittsburgh, writes to THE STANDARD:

I know that your conclusions were right in regard to the discussion which the tariff issue will bring up. Our local papers are beginning to teem with articles from workmen, etc., who take the stand for free trade, and the protectionists are making such absurd arguments in refutation that a child can see through their flimsiness. A glance over THE STANDARD exchanges confirms Mr. Roberts's statement. Here, for instance, is what the Mauch Chunk Democrat says of the situation:

For many years public opinion was overwhelmingly on the side of the high tariff and taxation idea, and but few men were bold enough to express themselves either as free traders or for low tariff tax only for revenue. But, the change from error to truth and common sense was bound to come, the campaign opened, though many in Pennsylvania several years ago. During the last congress three out of eight democratic representatives in congress, Storn, Scott and Swope, boldly voted on the side of tariff reform. And now the great tax equalization proclamation—the president's message is before the country, the issue is made and it can no longer be dodged or ignored, and if we are not outrageously mistaken the change of popular sentiment generally, without regard to party, now going on, is much more rapid and positive for liberating the tariff than the change of sentiment for emancipation during the corresponding period of a century ago. We are already in the period of the great tariff tax revolution. And an avowed "never go backward," victory is certain and near.

Resolved, That whereas the policy of a protective tariff has resulted in benefiting a few capitalists at the expense of the many workmen by making millionaires of the former and paupers of the latter;

Resolved, That the strikes and labor troubles, resulting in distress and bloodshed, are the result of this policy;

Resolved, That the effect of the protective policy is to reduce wages to the lowest possible point and raise living to the highest point.

Resolved, That competition protects the majority and protection protects the minority.

Resolved, That a protective policy has sprang the wheels of industry and made combinations possible and dictatorial.

Here, again, is an extract from a letter to THE PITTSBURGH PRESS, suggestive of the spread of truly radical ideas:

Land, labor and capital are the factors in production, but the free gift of God for the equal benefit of all, and labor exercised on land and its products evolves all wealth that is properly capital; therefore all production is due to human labor and should go to it either directly as wages or indirectly as interest on capital. Land value is the concomitant of population, and it is not capital, nor is it a labor basis, as all proper capital has, but as it is so used in the present vicious system I will call it bogus capital. According to these principles any rent or price for land is a wrong to labor directly or indirectly. These are beneficent principles of reform which, if adopted, will prevent the numerous wrongs and evils which cannot be remedied under the present system.

The communication from Mr. Estell, which we print in another column, tells how the light is spreading among the miners whom the cry of protection and "good times

coming" has fooled so long. All through the protection ridden state, from Philadelphia, where the anti-poverty society is working to such good purpose, and the Record is striking such sturdy blows for free trade through the collieries and furnaces, through the great manufacturing towns—everywhere the people are asking "why?" And they are learning the answer to the question.

Of course the pro-poverty side is not silent; but their trouble is that the more they say the more the verdict goes against them. Here is the sort of thing THE PITTSBURGH PRESS gets from one of its protection correspondents. He is endeavoring to answer a free trade correspondent, who wrote under the pseudonym of "Workman":

"Workman" further says: "All wealth comes from the land." So it does, but through a protective tariff only. He asks Mr. Reese or some other protectionist to tell him how tariff will make land more productive. Well, if "Workman" comes up here in the coke region he can easily see how a tariff has made the land more productive. He can see how it has increased in value from \$50 to \$200 per acre.

He must have a protective tariff; first, that the manufacturer can command a good price for his products, and secondly, that we can command a good price for our services. Argument like this is of the genuine boom-rang order. The more of it the protection advocates indulge in the sooner will they learn what a vain thing they are imagining.

Rabbi Jesselson in Columbus.
COLUMBUS, Ohio, March 28.—At the Jewish temple in this city Rabbi Jesselson yesterday delivered a remarkable address. The rabbi is an ardent friend of our cause. He has attended some of our meetings, and his address was in fulfillment of a promise to give utterance to his belief.

Rabbi Jesselson began his address by stating that he would discuss the present labor question from a Jewish standpoint. All the great questions of to-day have been entered into and in a manner solved by the sages of Israel. The bible is not wholly a religious book; it has not been handed down to us merely as a guide for the priest, but is intended by its teachings to warn us of the dangers which have assailed the past, and which yet threaten us, and to point out in forcible language the manner of avoiding such evils.

Referring to strikes, he said: Exodus, the event we celebrate as the greatest in our history, was but a gigantic strike which then, as now, proved the only remedy against oppression. He likened the struggle between capital and labor to that between Israel and Pharaoh, the king and the people. To-day the capitalists cry: "Humanity, you say! Respect of rights! What have we to do with these? With humanity we can get no profit. God and humanity are excellent for church purposes, but for practical life—bosh."

Pharaoh cries to Moses: "Wherefore do you keep the people from their work? You are a demagogue; a man who is dangerous to me; a disturber and agitator; you shall die." This is not quoted from some manifesto of a railroad king, but were words spoken and acted by the king of Egypt. And Israel rebelled—struck work. When men are sore pressed and their plights and distresses are not listened to, they know mind with want and loss of hope, and thus revolutions are born. So to-day, unless these men are listened to patiently, we may fear the worst, and the terrible movement will be beyond power of check and we will regret our former apathy.

Referring to the land question he said: I agree with Dr. McGlynn in this. He has my fullest sympathy, and the great father of this movement, Henry George, has also my fullest sympathy. I believe in these men, and it is my sincere hope that they will go on as they have begun. Therein lies our safety as a nation.

The doctor then dwelt on the beauties of the Jewish legislation on this question, and suggested that only by a return to the simple and comprehensive laws of Moses, improved by modern research and intelligence, could we hope for a peaceful solution of our social question; that this Mosaic law is founded on eternal justice, the very essence of God's love and mercy, and recognizes in all men equal rights before God and his law.

Edw. L. HYEMAN,
Sec. Land and Labor Club No. 3.

Has Changed His Mind.

HAMILTON, Ohio.—About the time Henry George and a few others took the stand they did against placing a presidential candidate in the field this year I was considerably discouraged, and thought they were all wrong. But I see clearly now that it was bad judgment on my part and that I was wrong. In the light of past events and the stand President Cleveland has taken in favor of a reduction in indirect taxation, I think your decision is the shrewdest move that has been made since we had an organization at all. By pushing the war into Africa with our Spanish artillery we can prove ourselves to be mighty troublemakers "thorn in the flesh" to the old political machines, and literally force one or the other of them to go our way, especially as the old parties are now nearly equally divided.

INVINCIBLE.

Land and Labor in Chicago.

CHICAGO, March 31.—Land and labor club No. 1 of Illinois has been for a year past holding very pleasant and profitable meetings; at first every fortnight, but since Christmas weekly. Our attendance averages forty, with a large proportion of ladies. We have some very bright, brainy members, who seldom fail to make us feel sorry when half-past ten sounds from the board of trade close by. It is sometimes 11 before we adjourn.

Last Thursday it was resolved that a state conference should be called to meet at the close of the Bailey conference, to be held here on Independence day. We shall try to make it successful, in the hope that it may lead to a better acquaintance and a closer union between all who live in Illinois—and love the cause.

We had an animated discussion of half an hour on the subject of interest, Professor Orchardson and Mr. Furbish attacking Henry George's views of its rightfulness and Messrs. Malcolm, White and Beck taking the other side. This was followed by an admirable paper from our president, Mr. R. H. Cowdrey (who by the left the club room in time to see his place of business completely destroyed by fire). We hope soon to have it in tract form, when others will be able to enjoy it as we did. As usual, we had some good singing from one of our members, accompanied by his wife, on the piano loaned us by Miss Leonard Beck.

Our association will be glad to correspond with friends of the cause throughout the state of Illinois. FRANK PEARSON, Secretary, 45 La Salle street.

Anti-Poverty in St. Louis.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., March 27.—An interesting meeting of the anti-poverty society was held last Sunday night at the hall corner of Ninth and Franklin avenues. President Mansel opened the meeting with a few pertinent remarks, stating briefly, yet comprehensively, the tenets and objects of the society, and then introduced Mr. Roth as chairman.

The speakers of the evening were Hon.

George W. Davidson, George M. Jackson and E. Meyer, all of whom delivered able and forcible addresses. The chief topic of discussion was the political duty of the society's members, and it was forcibly urged that a straight labor ticket should be nominated and the two old parties left severely alone. At the next meeting of the society the question of sending delegates to the Cincinnati convention of May 15 will be discussed.

Progress in Iowa.

FOREST CITY, Iowa, March 29.—I have believed in the doctrine of the single tax for several years, and two years ago I began to agitate it. People were induced to read my articles through curiosity, and with many the doctrine found ready and easy acceptance. We have since made such advance that I think a measure for taxing land values, exclusive of improvements, would be approved by the majority of men in this county. The county is only half settled. The rest of the land is held by eastern and European speculators. One-third of our settlers do not own the land they work, but are only tenants. This spring landlairs are demanding outrageous leases, in which the tenant stipulates to waive trial by jury in the event of a dispute arising between the parties to the lease, and agrees to abide by the decision of the court alone.

If the democrats adopt a platform in line with the president's message we will be opposed to an independent candidate for the single tax party. We should take one step at a time, and the first step is to abolish protection.

We are making more converts among republicans than among democrats.

W. W. OLMSTED.

Tax Reform in Texas.

The following is in response to a letter asking if the organization of the tax reform association, which is doing such good work in Texas, is not too elaborate:

HOUSTON, Tex.—The laws of the National tax reform association are too elaborate, and in practice we disregard them and allow to local clubs the largest individual freedom. Thus in Galveston there is only one club, though its membership is probably equal to that of the four clubs in this city combined. And we have more than five members in each of our clubs. The point that I wanted to make was that three men, or even one man, in any community could go to work and do effective service, without making any particular fuss about it. People don't like to be considered cranks, and you can't get them out to public meetings at first. You can, however, get them to listen in private conversation. Our bylaws should be remodeled, and perhaps we can really organize a National tax reform association at the Chicago conference in July.

We are gaining ground in this community at a rate which exceeds my most sanguine expectations. We are working so quietly as not to bring down upon ourselves any opposition or personal odium. At the same time our work is couching. A prominent local politician came to me yesterday and said we were right, that we had converted him, and he is talking for us on the street corners, simply in my opinion, because he thinks ours is to be the winning side. Last Sunday we organized a club of seventeen farmers eight miles from town—getting every single man in the settlement.

H. F. RING.

THE WESTERN WAR.

The Railroad Companies and the Engineers in Close Conflict.

It would seem as if the struggle now going on between the organizations of labor and organized capital would take on many of the features of the late war for the Union. The skirmishes ended when the street railroad strikes took place in this city two years ago. Since that time it has been a bold grapple, a locking of horns, a determination on both sides to try conclusions, to see—in prize ring parlance—who was the best man. Although the street railroad men were to a certain extent defeated, the result of their fight was to strengthen the associations of working people throughout the country. A large proportion of the contests between employers and employed in 1886 and the earlier part of 1887 were decided in favor of the employed. With the exception of the Pennsylvania coal miners' strikes, which began last April, there seems to be a disposition on both sides to let matters stand as they were for a while.

Almost in the beginning of this year, however, the struggle was recommenced through a difference between the Burlington railroad company of Chicago and the western brotherhood of locomotive engineers. For a time the fight was carried on in an amicable and conservative spirit; but the developments at the opening of the present week would indicate that there will be no further parley—that the hatchets have been dug up, that an industrial war is upon us.

The record of the week up to the time THE STANDARD goes to press is as follows: SUNDAY, April 1.—Chicago.—At one o'clock a. m. the men of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, the Chicago and Alton, the Lake Shore, the Michigan Southern, the Pan Handle and the Port Wayne—one of the largest trunk lines entering the city—were called out, and when morning came it found the Chicago division of the St. Paul road hopelessly paralyzed. Every engineer, fireman and switchman had quit work. These strikes are "sympathetic," the men refusing to handle or move "Q" (Burlington) cars.

MONDAY, April 2.—Chicago.—A Pan Handle freight train was attacked by strikers and the train hands put to flight. Several collisions occurred at Western avenue between the police of the St. Paul company and the strikers, several shots being fired. The Chicago, St. Paul and Milwaukee mail train No. 3 was delayed by a misplaced switch, thrown open by some unknown person.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—The switch engineers and firemen of all the roads entering the city, with the exception of the Burlington, resolved not to handle any Burlington freight after noon, except live stock or perishable freight which had been started previous to that hour, and the roads were so notified.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—The engineers, firemen, brakemen and switchmen of the Ohio, Indianapolis and Western were to strike at midnight. There were indications that a general tie-up of all the roads leading west would take place within three days.

MILWAUKEE, Wis.—The switchmen employed in the yards of the St. Paul company refused not to handle any Burlington freight after eleven o'clock. The engineers threatened to join the switchmen.

CLEVELAND, O.—Being tired of hotel life in Chicago, Chief Arthur has returned to the comforts and seclusion of his home. He gave the papers a long interview, in which he told how badly the Burlington was crippled. He "holds President Perkins and General Manager Stone personally responsible for the present state of affairs." He does not say anything about the charge of the strike having been put out of his hands, but thinks that "it would be a great liberty to let the country at large should the Burlington succeed in winning this strike," because "if

the brotherhood is broken up the engineers will go into other labor organizations where strikes will be as common as they are among the other classes of workmen." While the struggle is progressing Mr. Arthur will rest.

Crescent, Ia.—A mob made an attack on the guards at one of the gates leading into the roundhouse yard, drove the guards away and assaulted and badly pounded up eight of the men. Soon after about seventy-five heading men attacked the mob and dispersed them.

Troy, N. Y.—Thirty switchmen passed through here to-day on their way west to take the places of strikers in Chicago.

TUESDAY, April 3.—Chicago.—The situation in this city yesterday was very grave. An attempt was made to transfer a train of twenty Burlington freight cars to the Michigan Central under escort of armed guards and city policemen. The Michigan Central crews unanimously refused to handle the train. An attempt to transfer a train to the Chicago and Atlantic yard was also a failure. Several other attempts to move cars were defeated, stones and other missiles being freely used. The railroad yards are patrolled by Pinkerton men and the police stations are filled with reserves. It is believed that a riot is imminent.

MILWAUKEE.—The St. Paul road to-day reduced its force along its lines by laying off between 4,000 and 5,000 men, many of whom are clerks in the offices here. The switchmen are handling all local cars, but as shipments are not being made to country points, there is little to do.

PITTSBURGH.—Captain Linden, superintendent of Pinkerton's eastern agency, with a party of fifty detectives, were in the city this morning on their way to Chicago.

PHILADELPHIA.—Captain Dougherty of the Pinkerton agency had his hands full to-day recruiting switchmen, conductors and switchmen for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy railroad. About 100 men appeared at his office. Most of the applicants were from the ranks of the late strikers on the Reading railroad system. About fifty men were engaged.

WEDNESDAY, April 4.—Chicago.—Yesterday afternoon occurred what appears to be a break in the strike. The Michigan Central and Fort Wayne men returned to work, and agreed to handle Burlington freight. There were a number of collisions at the depots during the day. The conductors' society published an official statement that they were not in sympathy with the present strike.

A STANDARD reporter visited a number of railroad engineers, firemen, etc., to get their opinions as to the probable spread of the strike. The weight of opinion seemed to be that the strike would spread west, but not east; "for," said one of them, "the managers of the strike will be sure to be disobeyed on some of the eastern roads if they attempt to turn the strike this way. Westward they may have a clear field." The railroad men in this vicinity are non-communative, but it is easy to see that they are watching events with a great deal of anxiety.

In New York.

The journeymen brewers of this city appear to be again on the eve of a fight with their bosses. After a long struggle, during which a boycott was placed on nearly every boss brewer in this city, an agreement was reached a year ago which has resulted in peace up to the present time. But the time is close at hand when a new understanding must be reached or the agreement of last year renewed. About a month ago a semi-official announcement was made that the boss brewers did not intend to sign any agreement with their employees for the coming year through their organizations, but would deal separately with each individual in their employ. Since that announcement appeared the officers of the various journeymen brewers' organizations have been actively preparing to resist the bosses. Last Sunday morning the journeymen met at Clarendon hall to continue on their future course. They decided to continue to work until some of the Central labor union had waited on their employers. The committees will present to the bosses a contract, which they will be asked to sign. If this is refused, then final action will be taken. Several of the brewers have already made terms with their men, but it is expected that the majority will refuse to sign the contract, whereupon a strike will result. The struggle, when it does come, will be a long one, for an agreement has been reached by the employing brewers by which they will make a pool so as to sell the boycotted beers, as they hope, in spite of the efforts of the journeymen and those who sympathize with them. The latest report was that eighteen boss brewers had signed new contracts for the year.

A tie-up was threatened last Monday on the cross-town surface railroad in Brooklyn. Typographical union No. 6 last Sunday withdrew its delegates to the Central labor union.

A Suggestion.

PORT Jervis, March 31.—The miners of Pennsylvania are, many of them, virtual slaves, not mere serfs of the soil, but slaves, wearing themselves away in the bowels of the earth for the mere pittance that sustains their lives and those of their miserable families. They are subjected to the competition of Hungarian hordes from the provinces bordering on Turkey, whose wages are lowest, imported to keep the men of Pennsylvania in subjection, to stifle the spirit of native manhood. I know of no better campaign literature than the articles furnished by Henry George to the North American Review during the summer of 1886, reporting the condition of the coal and iron mines of Pennsylvania. I hope that these reports will be plentifully circulated throughout the country the coming summer, in order that all the Union may be apprised of the condition of things and unite to abolish this terrible, degrading, disgraceful system.

B. F. HENLEY.

Trades Union Methods Extending.

The San Francisco correspondent of the Tribune asserts that the leading wine merchants of this city have formed a wine dealers' association and issued notice to Napa and Sonoma vineyardists that hereafter they will buy no wine from those who do not deal exclusively with them. The association also fixes the prices to be paid for wine. By this combination the wine producer is shut off from selling a few gallons or a barrel of choice wine to a private purchaser, and he is forced to give all his wine to the association at a fixed price. Dealers this year will pay only eighteen cents per gallon, which leaves a narrow margin of profit to the producers. The correspondent says this wine boycott, as it is called by vineyardists, will result in discouraging the planting of new vineyards to choice wine grapes.

He Likes the Idea.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 2.—I like the plan of the "Society Notes" column in THE STANDARD, presenting alternately pictures from the extremes of society. There is enough of a shock produced by the sudden change to set people thinking. It is the awful contrast that shows the breaking down of republican government.

A. C. KENZIE.

GETTING INTO SOCIETY.

Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood Gives Some Advice to Poor Young Wives—How to Get There and How to Behave When You Are There.

"An American at home," says Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood, "if he leads a good and useful life, is a nobleman, as good as anybody, and he and his wife are entitled to the very best the world offer."

Mrs. Sherwood has been telling the readers of that staunch democratic journal, the Sun, something about how to get into New York society and how to behave after you get there. "It is hard," Mrs. Sherwood tells us, "to imagine a young couple who have to begin life without acquaintances, but the fact exists." It is a pitiable truth that there are people old enough to be married—indeed, actually married—who are not yet in society. What are these unfortunate to do? To remain permanently out of society would be inconceivable misery. Yet how shall they get in? As Mrs. Sherwood pathetically puts it:

How shall they begin? Who is to find them out? Who shall drive the entering wedge into this dense block which we call society? The answer is generally that somebody will turn up who will introduce them to somebody. Nice young people do not remain long unknown. But these early days are lonely to the poor young wife, who sighs for the brilliant belle whom she has left behind her.

Profane people might remark that there are quite a number of persons, both in society and out of it, who are by no means anxious to be found out. But THE STANDARD is above such rascality. Let us go on in a spirit of humble teachableness to learn what it is that these nice young people, this "poor young wife"—and presumably, the poor young husband of the poor young wife as well—must do to get into society and so be saved. For manifestly it won't do for them to wait for somebody to turn up to introduce them to somebody. Mrs. Sherwood doesn't suggest that they should do that. They must hustle for position if they want to achieve any social success.

There is one way of getting into society which Mrs. Sherwood suggests to her disciples, by advising them on no account to take it:

A young married woman, if she be pretty and unknown, is exposed to one danger which her husband must guard her against. Some faded beau of fashion may find her out and promise to introduce her into society if she will flirt with him. This succeeds wonderfully well at first, as all empirical remedies are said to do, but is apt to be fatal in the end. For even a fashionable position, which is not the best thing to strive for, must be honestly gained if it is going to last at all.

Mrs. Sherwood is probably sincere in advising the poor young wife not to take this method of "driving the entering wedge," but the fact that she finds it necessary to mention it is a queer commentary on "society." However, let that pass. There are other less questionable methods which this priestess of society feels at liberty to indorse.

In the first place, the "poor young wife," supposing her to come from some other city, may have letters of introduction from people in society in that city to people in society in this city. If she is happily furnished with such documentary evidences of social eligibility she must "lose no time in leaving them, with her card, and then she must wait until they are answered." This method, Mrs. Sherwood confesses, is not absolutely infallible, because "in this country people are singularly inattentive to letters of introduction." If the person to whom a letter is addressed "does not choose to receive the person whom it introduces, she has no redress." Mrs. Sherwood gently chides this sort of thing as "great rudeness," and points out that in England "great attention is paid to letters of introduction; the bearer is asked to dinner and receives other attentions."

Suppose, then, that the poor young wife, having sent her letters of introduction with her card, gets no invitation to dinner or "other attentions," but is left to dwell, peak and pine in the parlor of her \$20 flat, sighing for "the brilliant belle whom she has left behind her," and only imperfectly consoled by the attentions of her poor young husband. What is she to do in such a case? Mrs. Sherwood is ready with a ready answer: "Two—or should we say, number three? The young woman must consider if she has not some special talent, such as music, in which case she soon gathers about her a congenial circle." This method is rather obscure as to details, and we are left in doubt as to whether the young woman should "drive the entering wedge" by hiring a piano and "playing in her own apartment with the windows open, or by giving *ad libitum* performances on the violin, piccolo or tambourine in front of society's doors. However, Mrs. Sherwood is probably going to write some more about society, and may elucidate this matter in a future communication to the Sun.

Still, it isn't given to every poor young wife to have a special talent. What is to be done if the letters of introduction remain unnoticed, and the piano can't be played? Ah! In that case she must cultivate a taste for charities or good works—Mrs. Sherwood is responsible for that "or"—and that will bring her into the charmed circle, if nothing else will. Of course she must be sincere. No humbug or hypocrisy is due for society. No charity in New York, Mrs. Sherwood tells us, shudderingly:

One charity in New York is now called "The Stepping Stone," so many young women of social ambition joined it simply that they might know the eminent ladies who compose its board of directors. When a woman uses her religion or her charity to increase her fashion, she deserves to be found out and turned out.

Alas! again the oracle is obscure. What is that charity that has become so fashionably debased as to be known as "The Stepping Stone"? How is the poor young wife who has saved \$5 from her housekeeping money to know that she isn't squandering it upon a useless "stepping stone" when she subscribes it to charity? Fancy the argument of the woman who has let the pure fountain of her charity splash uselessly upon a "stepping stone." How is it to be retrieved? Mrs. Sherwood doesn't tell us. She must write another article.

Meantime, we have in the present essay some "pointers" about the way the poor young couple should behave after the entering wedge has been driven, and they have got into society. Mrs. Sherwood advises 4 o'clock tea to begin with.

She can send her card and give a tea without much expense or formality, and without being thought pushing or pretentious. If people choose to stay away, that need not hurt her; if they send a card, that is a visit, and she may go and see them, as she pleases. It generally opens the way to a pleasing acquaintance. If people do come, she should be cordial, and the lady who receives should rise and extend her hand. It is the American custom, by far the best custom. She should be so agreeable that all her new friends feel that she should be cultivated. Make them all wish to come again, young hostess. It is not customary to introduce the residents of the same city. Strangers should be introduced, but ladies who sit near to each other should speak to each other, if they wish to make it agreeable to both hostess and guest. The custom of reception days and these 4 o'clock

teas are meant to save labor and to make all the interests of society harmonize.

If the 4 o'clock teas are a success, invitations to dinner will probably come pouring in. These must be answered immediately; and if they are accepted—as of course they will be—the young couple must be on their best behavior.

Formerly it was the custom for a wife to take her husband's arm on entering a room; now that is considered old-fashioned. The lady enters first, the gentleman following with his crush hat in his hand.

Don't neglect the crush hat. It is important. Above all, let there be no pushing, no matter how poor you may be.

No lady will push herself. She will be a lady through all the trials of poverty, and the greater trials of sudden and crude wealth. She will do her part in the social world, gently, honorably and well.

Good breeding is very essential: It is easy enough to learn when and where to eat a card, how to behave at a dinner, how to eat with one's fork and to use a finger bowl, how to dress, where to sit in a carriage, how to bow and how to courtesy, how to receive and how to drop an acquaintance—these are a varied education that which teaches us to be well bred. Can we acquire it? Can we get to be a thoroughbred all by ourselves?

Yes, Mrs. Sherwood thinks we can, and we suppose she knows, though there seems to be a certain confusion of thought in the remark about getting to be a thoroughbred all by one's self. The "poor young wife" who adopts Mrs. Sherwood's suggestions, and wriggles herself into society, will be apt to have a pretty good time, but the poor young husband will probably find it necessary to strike for higher wages before the first 4 o'clock tea comes off.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

A non-partisan reform league has been formed in Minneapolis, and has issued a tract advocating the repeal of the tariff.

Mr. George himself accepts the situation in a patriotic spirit, and we cannot but do him the justice to say so. If that is inconsistency, we glory in it.—Grand Rapids Leader.

The senate of New Jersey has passed a bill providing that all railroad and canal property shall be taxed the same as that of individuals, and that corporate owners will be liable to the same tax.

There is one thing that ought to be insisted on at once and everywhere in the matter of convict labor, and that is that the profits on convict labor above expense of maintenance should go to the families of the prisoners.—Labor's Stage.

The Magnolia farmers' alliance of Texas have resolved that they will not support any candidate for the legislature who will not pledge himself to vote for imposing such taxes on non-resident land owners as will compel them to sell at a fair value.

This is probably the only country in the world that tolerates within its borders armed and officered bands of mercenaries not recognized either by the civil law or by the military establishment, but ready at the word of command to march out and strike.

The "Pinkerton men" ought to depart.—Boston Globe.

The Minnesota farmers' alliance, at their session of March 25, adopted the following resolutions:

Herve Riel.

Robert Browning.
On the sea and at the Hogue, sixteen hundred
ninety-two,
Did the English fight the French—was it
France?
And the thirty-first of May, helter skelter
through the blue,
Like a crowd of frightened porpoises a shoal
of sharks pursue,
Came crowding ship on ship to St. Malo on
the Rance,
With the English fleet in view.

'Twas the squadron that escaped, with the
victor in full chase:
First and foremost of the drove, in his great
ship, Damfreville;
Close on him fell, great and small,
Twenty-two good ships in all;
And they signaled to the place,
"Help the winners of a race!"

Get us guidance, give us harbor, take us
quick, or, quicker still,
Here's the English can and will!"
Then the pilots of the place put out brisk, and
leaped on board:
"Why, what hope or chance have ships like
these to pass?" laughed they:
"Rocks to starboard, rocks to port, all the
passage scarred and scored,
Shall the Formidable, here, with her twelve
and eighty guns,
Think to make the river mouth by the single
narrow way?"

Trust to enter where 'tis tidlish for a craft
of twenty tons,
And with bow at full beside?
Now 'tis slackest ebb of tide.
Reach the mooring? Rather say,
While rock stands, or water runs,
Not a ship will leave the bay!"

Then was called a council straight:
Brief and bitter the debate.
"Here's the English at our heels; would you
have them take in tow
All that's left us of the fleet, linked together
stern and bow,
For a prize to Plymouth sound?
Better run the ships aground!"
("Ere Damfreville his speech.")

"Not a minute more to wait!
Let the engines all and each
Shove ashore, then blow up, burn the ves-
sels on the beach!
France must undergo her fate!"
"Give the word!" But no such word
Was ever spoke or heard:
For up stood, for on stepped, for in struck,
amid all these—
A captain, a lieutenant, a mate—first, sec-
ond, third!

No such man of mark, and meet
With this better to complete!
But a simple Breton sailor, pressed by
Tourville for the fleet,
A poor coasting pilot—he Herve Riel the
Croisicse.

And "What mockery or malice have we
here?" cried Herve Riel.
"Are you mad, you Malouins! Are you
cowards, fools or rogues?"
Talk to me of rocks and shoals—me, who took
the soundings, tell
On my fingers every bank, every shallow,
every well,
Twixt the offing here and Greve, where the
river disembogues!

Are you bought for English gold? Is it love
the lying's for?
Morn and eve, nights and day,
Have I piloted your bay,
Entered free and anchored fast at the foot of
Solidor.

Burn the fleet, and ruin France! That were
worse than fifty Herve!
Sirs, they know I speak the truth! Sirs,
believe me, there's a way!
Only let me lead the line,
Have the biggest ship to steer,
Get this Formidable clear,
Make the others follow mine,
And I lead them, most and least, by a passage
I know well.

Right to Solidor past Greve,
And there lay them safe and sound;
And, if one ship misbehaved—
Keel so much as grate the ground—
Why, I've nothing but my life; here's my
head!" cries Herve Riel.

Not a minute more to wait.
"Steer us in, then, small and great!"
Take the helm, lead the line, save the squad-
ron!" cried his chief.

Captains, give the sailor place!
He is admiral, in brief.
Still the north wind, by God's grace.
See the noble fellow's face,
As the big ship, with a bound,
Clears the entry like a bound,

Keeps the passage as its inch of way were
the sea's profound!
See, safe through shoal and rock,
How they follow in a flock:
Not a ship that misbehaves, not a keel that
grates the ground,
Not a sign that comes to grief!
The peril, see, is past!
All are hushed to the last!
And, just as Herve Riel bellows "Anchor!"
sure as fate.

Up the English come—too late!
So the storm subsides to calm:
They see the green trees wave
On the heights overlooking Greve;
Hearts that beat are stanch with balm.

"Just our capture to enhance,
Let the English rake the bay,
Gash their teeth and glare askance
As they canoodle away!"
"Xanth remained Solidor pleasant riding on
the Rance!"

How hope succeeds despair on each captain's
countenance!
Out burst all with one accord,
"This is paradise for hell!"
Let France, let France's king,
Thank the man that did the thing!

What a shock, and all one word,
"Herve Riel!"
As he stepped in front once more;
Not a symptom of surprise
In the frank blue Breton eyes—
Just the same man as before.

Then said Damfreville, "My friend,
I must speak out at the end,
Though I find the speaking hard;
Praise is deeper than the lips:
You have saved the king his ships;
You must name your own reward."

"Faith our sun was near eclipsed
Demand what'er you will,
France remains your debtor still.
Ask to heart's content, and have! or my
name's not Damfreville!"

Then a beam of fun outbreak
On the bearded mouth that spoke,
As the low heart laughed through
Those frank eyes of Breton blue—
"Since I need must say my say,
Since our boat the duty's done,
And from Bato roads to Croisic point what
is it but a run—
Since I have, I may;
Since the others go ashore—
Come! A good whole holiday!
Leave to go and see my wife, whom I call
the Belle Aureole!"

That he asked, and that he got—nothing
more.
Name and deed alike are lost;
Not a pillar nor a post

In his Croisic keeps alive the feat as it be-
fell;
Not a head in white and black
On a single fishing smack
Is memory of the man but for whom had gone
to wrack

All that France saved from the fight whence
England bore the bell.
Go to Paris; rank on rank
Search the heroes flung pell mell
On the Louvre, face and flank:
You shall look long enough ere you come to
Herve Riel.

So, for better and for worse,
Herve Riel, accept my verse!
In my verse, Herve Riel, do thou once more
Save the squadron, honor France, love thy
wife, the Belle Aureole!

FARMER JONES AND THE TARIFF.

Yes, I've got to quit farmin'. My jints
are gettin' stiff and somehow I get tired
now by night than I use to; and I notice that
Mary Jane sits down on her an' moves
sloower about the house. I reckon it's 'cause
we're gettin' old an' farmin' is one o' them
businesses that makes no 'lowance for
gettin' old.

Help! oh, I've tried that an' it don't pay.
Time you've paid your store bills and your
help there isn't anything left. It makes
one feel as if you were working for the
storekeeper and your hired men for noth-
ing and boardin' yourself.

My girls are all married now, and their
men are shiftin' for themselves, and one
by one my boys have been leavin' me and
goin' into business. I tried to keep them
on the farm—offered to divide it; or to buy
them another farm near by; but they
always said that farmin' didn't pay and
that they was going into somethin' where
work wasn't so hard and what work they
did do brought more pay. One is in the
lumber business—got a mill up in the
woods now and is gettin' rich. Bill went
up into the iron country and struck a mine
and got some fellows with money to go in
with him, and he's president of a stock
company an' workin' his mines, and they
say that he's rich too. Tom writ me last
year that I might find it pay good enough
to be raisin' corn, but that he found it a
heap easier and better payin' to be makin'
starch out of the corn us farmers raised.

I've hated to see my boys turnin' away
from what I've always reckoned the nob-
lest callin' men can follow, an' for a long
time I couldn't understand it. Fust I
thought they was gettin' lazy, and I use to
break out at them in that way, but I
know that I hadn't any cause, for stidier,
harder workin' boys never turned a sod
than mine were; and when I go to see
them I can see that they are workin' just
as hard, if not harder, than they did on
the farm.

I've been a thinkin' a good deal o' late
tryin' to get at the bottom of the matter.
I've noticed that my boys ain't the only
ones that's gone from the farms into the
shops. All round my neighborhood the
real bright, smart boys have drifted off to
the cities, and either gone in for their
selves or are working for others. Every
once in a while I find some paper with a
long editorial in it about the tendency of
population, towards the cities and over-
crowdin' of 'em, and they seem to think that
it is a bad thing, and to wonder that men
and boys will leave the pure air and inde-
pendent life of the farm for the crowded,
pinched, dependent life of the city. They
seem to think that somehow it's owin' to
men gettin' weaker, more womanlike, lov-
ing ease and the sight of the wealth of the
cities, even if they can't have it them-
selves, an' bein' hungry for a closer touch
with their fellow critters than they git on
the farms. There's somethin' in all this;
but these editorials don't make the boys
stick to the farms a bit closer, and the
cities keep on robbin' the country of its
brains, leaving it only its muscle. These
editors haven't got to the bottom of the
case by a long sight. And the bottom is
so all-fired clear when you come to look
for it steady that it is surprisin' that they
have missed it.

Now, if you'll let me fill my pipe again—
cigar? No, I'm beholden to you, but cigars
and plug hats and broadcloth coats
slipped out of my reach years ago; can't
afford 'em. And, queer, isn't it? but I can
always think better when my pipe is a
go'in'. I reckon it is 'cause these ques-
tions turn themselves over in one's mind
much as these clouds of tobacco smoke roll
over each other as they climb up. Well,
in my thinkin' of this question over it
shapes itself about this way:

What do men work for, anyway?
Money? No; beyond makin' their livin'
they are workin' to get the things that
money will buy. Someshort sighted ones
work only for the money, as if that was
the main thing, but most men want to get
money so that they can get with it some-
thing that they want. There isn't much
need of argument to prove that. Some-
one handy at puttin' facts into words has
said that "force runs on the line of least
resistance." That kind of a definition is as
handy as a foot rule. When you've got it
it makes lots of things easier to under-
stand; and the more you try it the truer it
appears to you. My cattle come up from
the valley pasture by the ravine instead of
directly up the hill. It is the law that ex-
plains why wagons and reapers and rail-
roads and all these contraptions to save
work have been made. When any of us
have a job to do we study how to do it the
easiest. We don't always hit it, and some-
times we go ploddin' along doin' things by
the hardest. But the quicker witted a
man is—the more he uses his head—the
less he finds he will have to use his muscles
in gettin' what he is after; and it's just
as true of gettin' money as of anything else.

We all want to get the most money
with the least amount of work—or you
may put it another way and get to the
same point by saying that we all want to
get the most money for what we raise.
Of course men are controlled in using their
power in makin' money by their bein'
able to do some things well and others not
at all, but each in his way obeys this law.

Nacherly, then, if everything is equal—
an' in the long run, if left alone, all ocu-
pations are about equal—men go into that
work for which they are best fitted; but if
things ain't equal, if greater advantages
are given to some class of work, so that
work of that kind will bring more money,
men will be drawn to it an' away from the

work that is disadvantaged. For instance,
farmers shift their crops to those which
bring the most profit; go to pork when that
rises, or corn, or butter, or wool.

Now in this country, for a hundred
years, we have been worshipin' manufac-
turers. All the talk has been about en-
couragin' 'em. You never heard tell
of a man comin' inter the country and
askin' the community to give him a bonus
if he would go to farmin', but it's a common
thing in the towns for men to ask and get
a snug bonus for goin' to manufacturin'.

An' congress has caught the same fever,
and it acts an' talks as if it hadn't much of
anything else to do but think up ways to
encourage all kinds of manufacturers.

They've advertised that the whole United
States was bound to give manufacturers
more than their even chance by taxin' the
goods of outside manufacturers, so that the
home fellows can get more for what they
make than they could if competition was
free. In fact, they have put a premium
on manufacturers of about fifty per cent to
get people to go into them.

Now, the other side of the disposition of
human nature to get the most it can for
the least effort, makes men throw off any
burden that hinders them in this gettin'
as fast and as far as they can. It costs
money to encourage manufacturers be-
cause it raises the price of things manu-
factured. Those who buy these things,
payin' more for them, are hindered just
so much in gettin' all they could for their
labor, and nacherly they try to pass the
cost off on to some one else. They can
do it if they can raise the price of what
they have to sell. If iron or steel or wool
rises, the men who use them in makin'
things raises the price of what they make.
Now it is pretty clear that the last shift of
this cost falls on the shoulders of the men
who can't raise the price of what they
make, the class who haven't and can't have
the control of this great "home market,"
of which we hear so much. An' this class
takes in the farmers and most of the men
who work for wages.

Now there's lots of reasons why manufac-
turers would rather be in the cities.
The railroads or the lakes or the ocean are
generally there, an' they can get the stuff
in easy and cheap that they want to work
up, and the same means makes the sendin'
away of what they make cheap an' easy too.

That the city is the home of manufac-
turers is shown by the way a city grows
up around a manufactory that is built up
by some work power.

Well, now, can't you see why our boys
go to the city? With the government
puttin' a premium on the manufacturers
which go to cities or make cities come to
them, and makin' the farmers pay that
premium—encouragin' manufacturers an'
discouragin' farmin'—can't you see that
any boy with brains an' gumption isn't
satisfied to stay on a farm?

Can't you see that the government has
smoothed down the lines of resistance
runnin' towards manufacturers, and that in
that business the same work can bring
more money? Why, if I wasn't so old an'
set in my ways, I'd give up farmin' and
go into manufacturin' myself.

P. J. SMALLLEY.

**Workmen Might Do Worse Than Ex-
perts to the South.**

London Saturday Review.
The English climate rises early and goes to
bed late, working eight or twelve hours a
day, either in her miserable garret or in a
huge manufacturing hive. Pinched with
hunger and cold, worn out with labor, exposed
to privation and degradation, her joyless life
strides behind her and before her, with no
pleasures to look back upon, no hope to look
forward to. The wages she earns, those
wages which proudly separates her from the
slave, are barely sufficient to keep body and
soul together all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
bed of rocks and sold to a respectable
family or perhaps a very rich one. In the
first case, she will probably be alone; in the
second, she will find other like herself. She
represents so much capital invested, and is
looked after with equivalent care. She is
servant whose wages have been paid twenty
years in advance. It is true they have not
been paid to her, but that is all the better
for the girl. She is well housed and well fed,
and looks after all at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

Risen Indeed.

From Lead a Hand.
Aye, the lilies are pure in their pallor, the
roses are fragrant and sweet,
The music pours out like a sea wave, break-
ing in praise at his feet,
Pulsing in passionate praises that Jesus has
risen again,
But we watch for the signs of his living in
the life of the children of men.

Wherever a mantle of pity falls soft on a
wound or a woe,
Wherever a peace or a pardon springs up to
o'ermaster a foe,
Wherever a soft hand of blessing outreaches
to succor a need,
Wherever springs bealing for wounding, the
Master is risen indeed.

Wherever the soul of a people, arising in
courage and might,
Bursts forth from the errors that shrouded its
hope in the gloom of the night,
Wherever in sight of God's legions the armies
of evil recede,
And truth was a soul or a kingdom, the
Master is risen indeed.

So fling out your banners, brave tollers;
bring lilies to alter and shrine;
Ring out, Easter bells; He has risen; for you is
the token and sign.
There's a world moving sunward and God-
ward; ye are called to the front; ye
must lead;

Behind are the grave and the darkness; the
Master is risen indeed.

"OUR" INDIANS.

"Most of my Indians are living in
houses," writes W. L. Lincoln, Indian agent
at Fort Belknap, Montana, in his seventh
annual report to the commissioners of In-
dian affairs, whereby the reader is left
to infer that "Mr. Lincoln's Indians" are
being civilized. But the reader is further
led to ask, "Well, what about my In-
dians?" surely if Mr. Lincoln has for
himself an Indian tribe or so, the rest of
us must have some interest in at least a
squaw or a papoose. The remainder of
the voluminous report of the commissioner
of Indian affairs for 1886, gives some sort
of an answer to the question. And ac-
cording as the report is opened on one
page or another the American citizen
finds that his Indians are drunken or so-
ber, lazy or industrious; that they worship
the Christian God, or long for their heath-
enish "sun dance"; that they are strong
and healthy, or suffer from some of those
loathsome diseases, the product of our
civilization and morality, which "have
taken hold on all and permeated the sys-
tem with some to such an extent as to be
beyond the reach of all remedial agents."

But the net result seems to be that our
civilization, advancing with the bible and
the whisky bottle, the saving drug and
the destroying disease, affects the Indian
more for bad than for good.

Many of the reports discuss the degener-
acy of the Indians, their ignorance, their
idleness and the causes. But there

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

"I love THE STANDARD dearly," writes a lady from the Pacific coast, sending an order for a dozen recruit subscriptions. "I love THE STANDARD dearly. But dearly as I love it, and anxious as I am for its success, if the object of these recruit subscriptions were merely to get new subscribers for THE STANDARD I shouldn't send them. I couldn't afford it." And then our friend goes on to tell us that what she feels she ought not to afford for the paper, she is perfectly certain she ought to afford for the cause. "I want to make converts," she writes. "I want to bring people to see the truth as I see it. I want to hasten the coming of God's kingdom upon earth. And scanty as are my means I cannot afford not to spend money for such a purpose."

Do you catch our friend's idea? Do you see the thought in her mind? She has learned to look upon this paper of ours, not as an end, but as a means—as an instrument to be used in doing her work.

And, good readers of THE STANDARD, this is just the sort of interest we want you to take. THE STANDARD is your paper, published to aid you in your work, and can never fill its proper sphere of usefulness until you utilize it to the utmost. It can do good work for you if you will use it; its force will largely go to waste if you do not.

Have you ever considered what the duty is that you owe to the cause in which you are interested? It is very simple. The problem before us is to turn public opinion our way—to make people think as we do. We must make our converts one by one. And we must do this largely by individual effort, each one of us striving to bring into the fold his own little band of converts. Our anti-poverty societies, our tax reform associations, our land and labor clubs, our political organizations, our STANDARD, our tracts and other literature are all of them only means to this end—instruments which we can use to advantage if we will, or suffer to lie idle if we prefer. To win success each one of us must make himself a center of individual effort—must feel himself responsible for bringing in the men and women in his neighborhood and whom he knows.

Al! if we would only do this, how soon would our triumph come. If each one of us would but number his friends as we would that he would know no rest and abate no effort until every one of them should be brought to our side. Who is there among us who couldn't attack a least half a dozen? And with each new convert fired in turn with the same missionary zeal, making himself the center of a new circle of effort—with the heaven of thought spreading and working more and more, day by day, through the whole lump of humanity—a single year would bring the victory.

Friends, the work is your work; the responsibility for its doing rests upon you; not one of you can evade his share. The tools lie ready to your hands. Will you use them?

Pa.—Inclosed find \$2.50, for which continue my subscription to THE STANDARD. Every paper received is a literary feast. May God bless the day when the ignorant people will get their eyes open.

BIRMINGHAM, Ala.—There is a great field of usefulness for THE STANDARD here, and it can't be my fault if it isn't worked for all it is worth, or pretty nearly. Our adversaries, the monopolists of earth, are working hard to help us. They are getting people into such a frame of mind that they really begin to see the cruel injustice of private land ownership for themselves without waiting for us to come and tell them about it.

I don't suppose there ever was a place where a man's labor ought to bring him in better returns than here. There are vast mineral deposits under ground, a fertile soil on top, and easy communication with the rest of the country. There is no limit to the wealth that labor might produce here. Yet, instead of labor being drawn here by high wages, we find capitalists going to buy mining properties because labor is cheap, and we see men hunting for work in our streets, and tramps hunted to our jails. Fancy tramps in Alabama!

Merchants ought to make money here, if anywhere in the world. There is an increasing population to be fed and clothed and housed, and our merchants ought to do an increasing and profitable trade. And they do, too. They make stacks and cords of money, buying and selling. Only they're not allowed to keep it. Just as soon as a merchant gets fairly established, has a good run of customers come to his store, and begins to see money ahead of him, Mr. Landlord comes "snooping" around, trying to find out what he's making, and raises the rent on him just enough not to drive him out of business. A merchant said to me the other day: "Blamed if I ain't got to change my name and put out a new sign. This store is kept by Sponge & Co."

"Why do you mean?" I asked him. "Why?" he said, "I been to work here more'n a year, working early and late, making sacrifices, giving folks bargains, and doing everything to draw trade to this stand. And now, when I've just got ready to go in and make money—when I was calculating to fill myself full of profits next year—my landlord steps in and squeezes me high about dry. He was here yesterday. Asked me if I wanted to stay another year. Said he was very sorry (he lied when he said it), but he had an offer for the place, and just about double my rent. If that ain't making a sponge out of a man, I don't know what is!"

I gave my merchant friend a few tracts and STANDARDS and a little straight talk. It didn't take five minutes for him to see the cat. Paddy jumped right into his lap and moved so loud you might have heard her a mile off. I inclose a list of recruit subscriptions and an order for some tracts and copies of "Protection or Free Trade?" Don't publish my name, for I'm a sponge myself and work for a sponge squeeze. If he found out what I am doing he'd give me one last squeeze and throw me away like a rotten orange. Yours for the cause.

That's the sort of a letter the publisher likes to get—pleasant to read, and pleasant to lay before the readers of THE STANDARD. Why don't we get more like it? This country of ours, whose boast it is that every man is guaranteed just as good a chance as every other man, is full of Birmingham. There isn't a country village, there isn't a western prairie, where the voice of the great tax gatherer isn't heard, crying, "Come up here, you foolish sponges, and be squeezed." The farmer who works

his own acres and flatters himself that he pays tribute to no man, has to do the sponge act just the same as everybody else. When he buys a plow, a Pennsylvania mine owner takes a squeeze at him. When he builds a house, a timber monopolist compresses him, and a hundred other monopolists give him smaller pinches. When he sends his crops to the market—ah! then he gets a squeeze that makes him fairly rain his wealth for Mr. Squeezer's benefit. His wife's dress pays tax to one monopolist. His children's shoes are taxed to benefit another. On everything he eats, and drinks, and wears, and buys, and sells, and wastes or uses, the tax gatherers, public and private, lay their hands. Just look about your own neighborhood and let the rest of THE STANDARD readers know what squeezing system is most in vogue where you live. And don't imagine that in doing this you will merely gratify curiosity. By studying your own neighborhood you will learn its point of least resistance. You will find out how to approach your neighbors and how to talk to them so as to make the act, as our Birmingham friend puts it, fairly jump into their laps. And one thing more. When you write to THE STANDARD, always say whether you are willing that your name should be published or not. Let us use it if you can—a name stamps a letter with the writer's individuality, and so adds to its weight; but if for any reason you feel compelled to act the part of Nicodemus, be sure we will respect your wishes.

Here are our terms for subscriptions to THE STANDARD:

One subscription, one year, . . . \$2.50
One subscription, six months, . . . 1.25
One subscription, three months,63
Three or more subscriptions:
One year, each, \$2.00
Six months, each, 1.00
Three months, each,50

After the first club of three has been sent, subsequent subscriptions may be forwarded at the same reduced rates.

Recruit subscriptions, for four weeks, will be received, singly or in clubs, to different addresses at fifteen cents each.

How many subscriptions have you sent us? How many have you a prospect of getting? How many have you tried to get? You needn't answer these questions to us. Answer them to yourself. And bethink you, while you are doing it, of what our California correspondent says in the letter quoted above. THE STANDARD is your instrument—one of the tools with which you must do your work. Nobody else can do your work for you; you must do it yourself, or suffer it to go undone. Up, then, and be doing! Your field of labor is right before you—all around you. And the more unpromising it is the greater the need that you should bestir yourself.

These recruit subscriptions, for example. Why don't you use them more? Have you used them at all yet? Have all of your acquaintances been reached? Have your clergyman, your lawyer, your doctor, your storekeeper—even your landlord, why not—been given a chance to learn the truth? If not, then your work is going undone.

And there is one suggestion the publisher would like to make about these recruit subscriptions. It may not be always safe or possible to let your friends know that you are having THE STANDARD sent to them, but whenever this can be done, it ought to be. A man will usually read a paper with twice the attention he might otherwise pay to it, if he knows it represents a friend's ideas. Even if he considers his friend's notions utterly foolish, he will be apt to read nevertheless, if only for the purpose of confuting foolishness. And all we need ask him to do is to read. The rest will take care of itself.

The recruiting fund. That is another tool, which gathers more rust than it ought to. Its object is to furnish literature—tracts, books and STANDARDS—to people who have the opportunity to distribute them, but can't afford to buy them. The fund has done good work in the past. It is doing good work now. It can do good work in the future. But see how slowly it grows. Think of all it might do, and how little it can do with its present feeble support. The fault is yours, STANDARDS readers. The tool is idle because you don't use it, and for no other reason. Read the list of contributors for the week just past, and ask yourselves how many village churches there are in the United States that would not in a single week contribute more to send missionaries to the heathen than you are doing to aid in lifting the yoke of poverty from the necks of sixty millions of your fellow countrymen.

The contributions to the recruiting fund for the past week have been:

J. Loeffler, New York, . . . \$3.00
T. J. L. 1.50
E. B. H. 2.00
E. B. H. 5.00
Nicodemus again, 1.00
Total for the week, \$12.50
Previously acknowledged, \$271.34
Total to date, \$283.84

Clipping a Piece from Every Man's Blanket.

Philadelphian Record.

This wool tax is in spirit similar to the old tax of England which, in order to encourage the sheep growers, provided that the dead should be buried in none but woolen shrouds. The wool duties in this country are more onerous than was the old protectionist statute of England, inasmuch as the former seriously affects the living. To the dead it made no difference whether their shrouds were of wool or of any other fabric; but in a climate like that which prevails in most portions of this country multitudes of the living suffer in diminished health and comfort from the duties on wool. All the blessings that the tariff is imagined to confer on the growers of sheep cannot outweigh the real privations which the wool duties inflict upon the American people.

Why Not Stay East and Vote to Make It Easier to Get Land By Taxing the Rent.

Philadelphia Record.

The principal reason why ambitious young men do not want to farm in the eastern states is that the location there requires a heavy capital if the farmer wishes to own his farm. His works will require him to get out more than the lowest interest on his capital employed and laborer's wages for his work. Young men ambitious to engage in farming, come west!

LIFE ON THIRTY SHILLINGS A WEEK.

Mrs. Miranda Hill in the Nineteenth Century.

People have been talking and writing on the subject of how to live on a moderate income. When I heard \$700 a year treated as a small sum on which a family had to manage economically, the thought came to me, "And yet, what good and happy homes one knows of where the income can hardly be more than one-tenth of that, say \$75, or \$80, weekly! Many working people manage on \$5 a week. How is it done?"

I determined to put down the details of the expenditure from one of my working friends, and, thinking over those who were likely to be able to give me the information I wanted, I remembered one home specially, whose bright, cheerful aspect and well cared for children I had known for some years.

The father, John Howe, a Cumberland man, had been a farm laborer in his youth. He had taught himself to read and write after he grew up, had saved money out of his small earnings in order to apprentice himself to a trade, and, after having thus become a skilled workman, had married and come to London, where he had found regular employment.

The father of that family is a man who has solved the problem, "How to live on thirty shillings a week, I don't know," said I to myself, "and if he has, I know well that neither will nor children have suffered stunted, either mentally or bodily. I will ask him to tell me how he has managed his income."

So I called at his home—he occupies two rooms in a small street in the northwest of London—and asked his little daughter to tell him that I should be glad if he would call and speak to me in the evening when he came back from work. He did so and the following conversation took place between us:

—You can, perhaps, give me some information I want if you will. Some friends and I have been talking over the question of means and working people's earnings and spendings and have been wondering whether we could learn how a working man with a family manages on \$5 a week.

My friend.—I can pretty well tell you that, because that was near about what I spent when my wife was at home. (She is very ill just now and absent from home.)

—You spent about \$5 a week?

Friend.—Yes, about eight-and-twenty or thirty shillings.

—Did that include clothes and everything?

Friend.—Yes.

—But you sometimes earn more than \$5, don't you?

Friend.—Oh, yes; I earn a little more sometimes, but I don't spend it; I save it.

—Then I may reckon yours as an example of how a family can live on \$5 a week?

Friend.—You may.

—Then I will put down the items as you tell me. You won't object to my doing that, I suppose?

Friend (smiling).—Not at all. (Doubtfully) You are not going to publish them—with my name!

—Neither with your name nor without, if you object to it. But, to tell you the truth, I did want to make use of the facts you tell me for publication, if you don't mind.

Friend.—Oh, no, I don't mind.

—Then, first, as to food. What do you spend on meat?

Friend (promptly).—Four shillings a week.

—Four shillings a week! Why, that is just half what a working woman told me she should spend for a smaller family than yours.

Friend.—I dare say; but then she probably buys her meat about where, where it costs 12d, or 18d per pound. I go down to the meat market, and at this time of year, when meat keeps well, I get in a week's supply. I can buy beautiful meat at 8d, or even 7d, a pound.

I got a splendid piece of leg of beef, 18 pounds, for 3s. I buy a piece of the leg like that because I find it useful. I can get sirloin very cheap too at 5d, or 5½d, per pound.

—Then, as to bread!

Friend (after some reflection and calculation).—Reckon ten of Neville's loaves a week, and that costs just over 3s. 4d, a loaf.

—That makes 2s. 4d. I notice you say Neville's bread? You take that in preference to baker's bread?

Friend (smiling).—The baker's is generally cheaper by far, but you eat more of it. It does not go so far as Neville's; so it is no cheaper in the end.

—And what do you reckon for flour?

Friend.—About two quarters in the week, at 6d, each.

Then followed the estimate for groceries, milk and vegetables as given in the table below:

I asked about fruit.

Friend.—Oh, yes. We spend a good deal on fruit in the summer—as much as 1s. 6d. a week, perhaps. That's what the lot of us is wanted for—the fruit puddings, you know.

—Then you must reckon for such. Or do you get them with your meat?

Friend.—That comes with the meat. I never object to half a pound of nice white suet with the meat.

—And I suppose that, in winter, currants and raisins would take the place of the fresh summer fruit?

Friend.—Yes. They would. The estimate as to coal and paraffine was given with great promptitude and accuracy, as if the amount used was quite well known, only my friend struck an average of cost because of the variation in winter and summer prices.

—Are you a teetotaler, or must we reckon something for beer?

Friend.—No, I am not a teetotaler. We take beer sometimes—for supper occasionally. In summer, when it is too hot to bear a fire, and we have a cold dinner, toward the end of the week, when we are finishing up the scraps, we have beer instead of tea.

—Then do I understand that you take tea with dinner sometimes?

Friend.—Yes, if it is a cold dinner like that; and if the weather is too hot for us to bear the fire, then we have beer. But I don't take that cheap beer. I don't approve of it. I take that at 3½d, per pint. Put down three pints a week for beer—that is 10½d.

—Then as to rent!

Friend.—Well, you know that—5s. 3d. a week.

—We must not forget school fees. How much are they?

Friend.—They are not much—only 1d. a week for each child at the board school.

—That makes 4d. And what about club money? I know you belong to a provident society.

Friend.—Yes; the club money comes to a good deal. I pay 1s. 6d. a week. But I pay more because I did not join till I was forty-one. A youth of eighteen who joins pays only 9d. a week and gets all the privileges that I have.

—And what are the privileges?

Friend.—Thirty shillings a week during sickness for one year, and after that ten shillings a week as long as the illness lasts. There is a man in our society who has had ten shillings a week for five years.

—And I think you told me once that there were some advantages of medical attendance for your family connected with your society, did you not?

Friend.—I did. The club doctor told me

that he would attend my wife and children whenever they needed it if I paid regularly 3d. a week for the wife and 1½d. for each child, if there were more than one who joined.

We reckoned up what this came to, and put it down. And here I may, remark, by the way, how gladly the thrifty and independent working people avail themselves of anything of the nature of a provident dispensary. They did not wish to receive medical attendance quite free, as a charity, and yet they cannot afford to pay ordinary fees. They gladly pay the small regular sum weekly to insure attendance during illness. "It is a capital plan, if the doctor is a good one," said one working woman to me; "and then, you see, it is to his interest to get you well soon."

Then came the question of clothes. My friend knew exactly what he had spent for boots in the last six months, and from this we found it was 8s. the average per week for that large and important item. He had also one fact very clear—that when first he came to London it had taken just 1s. 6d. a week to clothe him. He knew this because he had taken a loan society, and took three shares each of 6d. a week, and this just sufficed for his clothes. "But then I was very low in clothes. I don't spend so much now, and it included boots, so we must deduct for those," he said. We did so, and thus obtained 1s. a week for his clothes.

My friend explained to me the plan of these loan societies, and how useful he had found them. They had been a great help to him in furnishing and getting clothes when he first came to town, and he knew a man who had made a business in five years owing to their help.

"But is not the interest that you pay very high?" I asked.

Friend.—Yes, it is high; but then as long as you have "stock" in the society you receive an interest as well as paying it.

—Is not the danger of the society's failing through dishonest management?

Friend.—Well, it is the fault of those who join it if it does, because there are quarterly meetings, and every man who has a share has a voice in the management. Of course, if you can't be present, you must abide by the decision of those that can.

—We have not put any thing down yet for the clothes for your wife and children.

Friend.—Yes. That is where I am at a loss; I cannot tell so well about that as my wife could.

—He considered the matter a good deal, and finally made a rough guess at 2s. 6d. per week. I think myself that this was probably a little above the mark, comparing the sum with that for his own clothes. I noticed, in speaking to another working friend—a woman—that she had more difficulty in reckoning what was spent on clothes than anything else, the sums being larger and paid at irregular intervals. It was evidently the expenditure on clothes that would have to be cut down if means failed. "You would have to go shabby, that is all!" she said.

The final result of my friend's calculations is shown in the following table. The family consists of himself, his wife and five children, one an infant in arms:

Average Weekly Expenditure.

| | s. d. | p. | s. d. |
|--|-------|----|-------|
| Meat | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| Bread (10 loaves) | 2 | 12 | 5 |
| Four quarters of flour | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Vegetables, 15 pounds potatoes | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Other vegetables | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Butter | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Fruit | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Milk (1½ pints per day) | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| Tea (12 pounds) | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Coffee (2 pounds) | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Sugar (4 pounds) | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| Soap (1½ pounds) | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Candles, tallow | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Sundries | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Paraffine (12 gallons for fortnight) | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Coal (2 cwt.) | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Beer (4 pints at 1½d.) | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| Rent | 5 | 6 | 14 |
| Boots (for whole family) | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Clothes for the man | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Clothes for the wife and children | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| School fees | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Medical attendance for wife and children | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Balance out of \$5 a week | 1 | 9 | 12 |

And now, to what state of being does all this minister? What are the opportunities of my friend and his children for such higher enjoyment as we are the true realities of life?

First of all, though not possessing a large fortune of their own, only a window sill where flowers may grow, they are within reach of that public garden lately laid out by the vestry for the use of the neighborhood. "I can scarcely keep my children within doors," said my friend's wife to me one day, "since that garden has been open; they are always in it after school hours."

For my friend on his Saturday afternoon, as well as for the wealthiest in the land, are the British Museum with its antiquities, the South Kensington museum with its natural history specimens, the National gallery with its pictures, Westminster abbey with its monuments and services. Perhaps some day, nearer his own door if Maylebone does its duty, a free library may be accessible to him and his children.

In thinking of my friend I recall his intelligence and vitality, the acquaintance with facts that makes everything regarded with such interest—as were the sights on the river when we all went down to Southend by steamer last year. I remember the happy faces of wife and children as I met them coming over the Regent's park from a walk in the sunset light; the enjoyment the husband and wife had in a stroll together over the wider part of Hampstead Heath, and when, no doubt, the blue distance, the fir trees, and the gorse may have given him a faint suggestion of his native Cumberland hills; above all, I dwell on the resolution of this antiquated man, whose father and mother nursed the little baby through bronchitis, saving its life, as far as one could judge, by their unceasing watchfulness and care. As all this comes before me, I feel as if the highest blessings, simple reality, steadfast industry, the sense of usefulness, manly independence, the joy of family ties, and of the need and power to make sacrifices for these, were more likely to crown the life that has to contend with difficulties than that which is free to seek its own satisfaction. I think God that England counts among her children so many who know how to live simply and yet nobly on thirty shillings a week.

The Growth of Berlin.

Berlin Correspondence London Weekly Dispatch.

The Berliners who had laid in what used to be the outskirts of Berlin should be grateful to William and Bismarck for the glory they brought to Prussia. Its first effect was to make their city the banking and political capital of Germany. Berlin, which a quarter of a century ago was quite a small place, is now almost as big as Paris. Owners of sandy lots too poor to grow anything but broom have now fortunes comparable to those enjoyed by many of the great London landlords.

This extension of the city quickened speculation in building lots, a fever height and with the building of new quarters every trade received a powerful impetus; all the houses had to be furnished, and so cabinet makers, upholsterers, gas fitters, stove makers, cutlers, bakers and what not, gathered from other parts of Germany; but somehow the poor seem to get poorer while the rich grow richer.

How Nature Deals With Us.

As a fond mother, when the day is over, Leads by the hand her little child to bed, Half willing, half reluctant to be led, And leaves his broken playthings on the floor, Still gazing at them through the open door, Nor wholly reassured and comforted, By promises of others in their stead, Which, though more splendid, may not please him more; So nature deals with us, and take away Our playthings one by one, and by the hand Lead us to rest so gently that we go, Scarcely knowing if we wish to go or stay, Being to full of sleep to understand How far the unknown transcends the what we know.

PERSONAL.

R. M. Maxwell of Douglas, Iowa, contributes to the *Harlan Industrial American* an extremely calm and candid letter on the situation.

The *Chicago Labor Enquirer* of March 24 contains an able article (from Robert C. Cumming of Braceville, Ill., in which the doctrine of the single tax is expounded and defended.

Henry George will lecture in Brockton, Mass., on Friday evening, April 27, for the tariff reform league, and in Tremont temple, Boston, on Saturday evening, April 28, on free trade.

John F. Duncan has an article on "The folly of strikes," in a recent issue of the *Detroit Advance*, showing that industrial emancipation can be effected only by the destruction of land monopoly.

The *North American Review* for April contains a short but well written article by Benjamin Dobbin in answer to W. M. Fishback's essay on "Communism and Protection" in the February issue.

George J. Klinger of Brooklyn spoke on behalf of the Brooklyn single tax club at a recent debate between that organization and the prohibition club. Mr. Klinger traced poverty to its source in land monopoly and showed how little prohibition could do to ward its cure.

An eight-year-old boy, guilty of petty larceny, was sentenced to ten days' imprisonment with hard labor, whipping and five years in a reformatory. The same sentence was pronounced on three other boys—two of them ten years old and the other twelve.—*London Echo*.

A. E. Collier contributes a short article to the "Notes and Comments" department of the current number of the *North American Review*, in which he effectually disposes of Mr. Adams' "Georgeism making the rich richer," which appeared in a previous issue of the same magazine.

Miss Mary Leggett of Beatrice, Neb., was ordained a minister at the recent Unitarian conference at Kansas City. Miss Esther Frame, a Quaker, is said to have just finished a series of successful revival services in Nashville, but what a Quaker revival service can be like it is hard to imagine.

James W. Stillman of Boston has published a good essay on "The unconstitutionality, injustice and folly of the protective system." But, unfortunately, Mr. Stillman does not see the injustice and folly of a revenue tariff, and his essay lacks the force it would gain from the advocacy of real free trade.

William Morris is a poet, a painter and a scholar; he is likewise a carver of wood, a weaver of tapestries and a shoemaker. To the homes of those who wish to have their rooms made beautiful he gives with his pen in his hand as a British workman—a title in which he glories. His clothes are of stout rough material, he wears a woollen shirt and a soft hat.

The improvement in the condition of James Redpath still continues, and on Sunday he was able to attend Father Duncy's church. It will be a long time, however, before he is able to do any work. Contributions for the testimonial fund, which is intended to give him the long rest he so well deserves and so much needs, should be sent to Charles P. Wingate, 119 Pearl street, New York.

Professor Thorold Rogers, whose investigations during the past twenty years have shed so much light on the social economy of the middle ages, has been elected to the professorship of political economy in Oxford university. Professor Rogers is an old man, with a heavy sword, a pair of hawk eyes, an unquenchable and inexhaustible power of conversational invective, a tongue with the rough side often uppermost, and a heart as tender as a woman's.

Our correspondent, H. F. King, author of one of the most popular and labor tracts, "The Case Plainly Stated," and head of the Tax reform association, is city attorney of Houston, Texas. Some complaint has been made of the reappointment of Mr. King by the present mayor of Houston on the ground that he is a "land crank." The Houston *Echo* says of it: "We took upon the appointment of Mr. King as the wisest the present administration has made. There is not an able lawyer in the city."

P. H. Cummins of Amsterdam, who was the candidate of the united labor party for state treasurer last fall, has invented a skeleton